NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXVI.

MAY, 1887.

GRANT, THOMAS, LEE.

IN "Macmillan's Magazine" for March, 1887, published in London and New York, appears a most interesting article of ten pages from the pen of General Lord Wolseley, in which, reviewing the recent Memoirs of Robert E. Lee, his Military and Personal History, by Gen. A. L. Long and Gen. Marcus J. Wright, General Wolseley describes his personal acquaintance in 1862 with that famous man, the great impression made by his graceful manner and profound intelligence, and concludes with the following paragraph: "When all the angry feelings roused by secession are buried with those which existed when the Declaration of Independence was written, when Americans can review the history of their last great rebellion with calm impartiality, I believe all will admit that General Lee towered far above all men on either side in that struggle. I believe he will be regarded, not only as the most prominent figure of the Confederacy, but as the great American of the nineteenth century, whose statue is well worthy to stand on an equal pedestal with that of Washington, and whose memory is equally worthy to be enshrined in the hearts of all his countrymen."

As I happen to be one of the very few survivors of the great Civil War in America who had a personal and professional ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quaintance with the chief actors in that grand drama, I am compelled to join issue with General Wolseley in his conclusion, while willing to admit nearly all his premises. Though he is much my junior in years, I entertain for him the highest respect and admiration; he has deservedly gained fame by deeds here in America, in South Africa, Egypt, and in Great Britain. His estimate of the men whom he has met in life will command large attention, but I trust his judgment in this case will not be accepted by the military world as conclusive and final. In all wars, in all controversies, there are two sides, and the old Roman maxim applies, "*Audi alterem partem.*"

England has so long been accustomed to shape and mould the public opinion of our race, that her authors, critics, and officials seem to forget that times are changing, have changed. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland contained in 1880 only thirty-six millions of inhabitants, with an area of 121,571 square miles; whereas the United States of America had fifty millions of people, with 3,602,990 square miles of territory. Great Britain is crowded, whereas in our vast interior there still remains land enough for three hundred millions of inhabitants. All of these are taught the English language, believe in the Bible, Shakespeare, Milton, Walter Scott, Dickens, Thackeray and Tennyson; all read English magazines, periodicals, and newspapers, and have a way of thinking for themselves. They have had twenty-one years for thought and reflection since the smoke and confusion of battle obscured the horizon, and have settled down to the conclusion that Abraham Lincoln was the great civil hero of the war, and that Ulysses S. Grant was the chief military hero.

We all admit that General Robert E. Lee was, in the highest acceptation of the term, "a gentleman and a soldier." He did not graduate at the head of his class at West Point, as stated by General Wolseley, for "Cullum's Register" shows that Charles Mason, of New York, afterwards of Iowa, was No. 1 of the date of 1829; that Robert E. Lee, of Virginia, was No. 2, and that Joseph E. Johnston, also of Virginia, was No. 13 in that class of forty-six members. Lee was very handsome in person, gentle and dignified in manner, cool and self-possessed in the midst of confusion and battle, not seeking strife, but equal to it when it came, and the very type of manhood which would impress itself on the young enthusiast, General Wolseley. That special phase of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character which General Wolseley thinks a "weakness," his invariable submission to the President of the Southern Confederacy, is probably better understood on this than the other side of the Atlantic, where from childhood to manhood is impressed on us the old fundamental doctrine that the pen is mightier than the sword, and that the military *must* be subordinate to the civil authority. A *coup d'état* in this country would excite a general laugh, and I confess to a feeling of pride that at no period of our history has the idea of a military dictator found permanent lodgment in the brain of an American soldier or statesman. Mr. Lincoln, in assigning General Hooker to the command of the Army of the Potomac, wrote him, under date of January 26th, 1863, "I have heard in such a way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the army and the government needed a dictator. Of course it was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you the command. Only those generals who gain successes can set up dictators. What I ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship."

General Lee was a typical American, and knew that the Southern States could only succeed in forming an independent nation by united action under a President armed with both military and civil functions, and he was unquestionably right in subordinating his conduct to the head of the government which he had chosen and undertaken to support and defend.

Before entering upon the analysis of his military character and deeds, permit me to digress somewhat. General Wolseley constantly refers to the Revolutionary War of 1776 as similar to that of our Rebellion of 1861. They were as different as two things could possibly be. In the first our fathers most humbly and persistently petitioned the Parliament of Great Britain for the simple and common rights conceded to every Englishman; they were denied and repelled with a harshness and contumely which no British community of to-day would tolerate. They rebelled because they were denied the common inheritance of their race; and when they had achieved Independence they first undertook for themselves a government which was a "Confederacy of States," and which proved impracticable. Then, after years of hard experience, in 1789 they adopted the present Constitution of the United States, which, in its preamble, sets forth clearly: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a *more*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perfect Union, do ordain this Constitution, etc." This was not a contract between "Sovereign States," but a decree of the aggregate people of the whole United States. Now, on the other hand, there was a fair election in November, 1860, for a President under that Constitution. The Southern people freely participated in that election. After they were fairly beaten, and Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, was duly elected, some of the Southern leaders, delving back into the old abstractions of 1776–1789, revived this doctrine of State Allegiance: that a man happening to be born in a State, (an accident he could not control) his allegiance became due thereby to that State, and not to the aggregation of States, the Union. I have too high an opinion of General Robert E. Lee to believe that he could have been humbugged by such shallow doctrine. No! many of us believe that Lee, in 1861, saw and felt the approaching horrors and tortures of a civil war, resigned his commission in the army, hoped to hide away; first declined service in the so-called Confederacy, and accepted temporary service to defend Virginia, his native State; but, being possessed of large qualities, he was importuned, dragooned and forced to "go in," to drift over the Niagara which was inevitable, and which he must have foreseen. His letter of April 20th, 1861, addressed to Lieutenant-General Scott, is in that direction: "Since my interview with you on the 18th instant, I have felt that I ought no longer to retain my commission in the army. I therefore tender my resignation, which I request you will recommend for acceptance. It would have been presented at once but for the struggle it has cost me to separate myself from the service to which I have devoted all the best years of my life, and all the ability I possessed. During the whole of that time—more than a quarter of a century—I have experienced nothing but kindness from my superiors, and the most cordial friendship from my comrades. To no one, General, have I been so much indebted as to yourself for uniform kindness and consideration, and it has always been my ardent desire to merit your approbation. I shall carry to the grave the most grateful recollections of your kind consideration, and your name and fame will always be dear to me. Save in defense of my State, I never desire to draw my sword. Be pleased to accept my most earnest wishes for the continuance of your happiness and prosperity." His resignation was not accepted until April 25th, 1861 (Townsend, p. 31).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, on the 23d day of the same April, he issued his general orders No. 1 from his headquarters in Richmond, Virginia:

"In obedience to orders from his Excellency John Letcher, Governor of the State, Major-General Robert E. Lee assumes command of the military and naval forces of Virginia."

To us in the United States of America this seems a sudden descent from the sublime to the ridiculous. Virginia had neither an army or navy, and such were forbidden to States by the Constitution which Lee had often sworn to maintain. (Article 1, Section 10.)

I have before me, in print, another letter, dated Arlington, Va., April 20th, 1861, addressed "My dear Sister," and signed "R. E. Lee," reciting that "the whole South is in a state of revolution, into which Virginia, after a long struggle, has been drawn, and though I recognize no necessity for this state of things, and would have foreborn and pleaded to the end for redress of grievances, real or supposed, yet in my own person I had to meet the question whether I would take part against my native State. With all my devotion to the Union, and the feeling of loyalty and duty of an American citizen, I have not been able to make up my mind to raise my hand against my relatives, my children, my home. I have therefore resigned my commission in the army, and, *save in defense of my native State,* with the hope that my poor services will never be needed, I hope I never may be called on to draw my sword. I know you will blame me, but you must think as kindly of me as you can, and believe that I have endeavored to do what I thought right." . . .

Now, at these dates, April 20th and 23d, 1861, the State of Virginia had not yet concluded "secession." According to McPherson, page 7, the convention in secret session adopted, April 17th, an ordinance of secession, but on April 25th that same convention adopted and ratified the Constitution of the Provisional Government of the Confederate States of America, "this ordinance to cease to have legal effect if the people voting on the ordinance of secession should reject it." The actual vote did not take place till June 25th,—128,884 for secession and 32,134 against it. How far Lee's defection had aided to create this majority is still the question. (See "Twenty Years in Congress," Blaine, Vol. 1, page 302.)

We all sympathize with the struggles of a strong man in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toils of other ambitious men, of less principle, who had use for Lee in their contemplated conspiracy. At that date there was a Virginia claiming sovereignty and the constitutional right to secede; but there was also a Confederacy embracing many States *already* in rebellion. Lee unquestionably took the oath to Virginia and the command of her "army and navy," then a myth, but it is a popular belief that he never took the oath of allegiance to the "Confederacy," although when General Johnston was wounded and disabled at "Fair Oaks," June 1st, 1862, General Lee did succeed him, and did command the Army of Northern Virginia under the Confederate Government till the end at Appomatox.

His sphere of action was, however, local. He never rose to the grand problem which involved a continent and future generations. His Virginia was to him the world. Though familiar with the geography of the interior of this great continent, he stood like a stone wall to defend Virginia against the "Huns and Goths" of the North, and he did it like a valiant knight as he was. He stood at the front porch battling with the flames whilst the kitchen and house were burning, sure in the end to consume the whole. Only twice, at Antietam and Gettysburg, did he venture outside on the "offensive defensive." In the first instance he knew personally his antagonist, and that a large fraction of his force would be held in reserve; in the last he assumed the bold "offensive," was badly beaten by Meade, and forced to retreat back to Virginia. As an aggressive soldier Lee was not a success, and in war that is the true and proper test. "Nothing succeeds like success." In defending Virginia and Richmond he did all a man could, but to him Virginia seemed the "Confederacy," and he stayed there whilst the Northern armies at the West were gaining the Mississippi, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, Georgia, South and North Carolina, yea, the Roanoke, after which his military acumen taught him that further tarrying in Richmond was absolute suicide.

Such is the military hero which General Wolseley would place in monument side by side with Washington, "the father of his country—First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." All that is good in the character of Gen. Robert E. Lee is ours, and we will cherish it, and we will be charitable to his weaknesses, but so long as the public record tells of U. S. Grant and George H. Thomas, we cannot be at a loss for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroes for whom to erect monuments like those of Nelson and Wellington in London, well worthy to stand side by side with the one which now graces our capitol city of "George Washington."

In 1861 General Lee was a colonel of cavalry on leave of absence at his home at Arlington, and U. S. Grant was an humble citizen of Galena, Illinois, toiling to support his family. He at first gave little heed to the political murmurs creeping over the land by reason of the election of Mr. Lincoln, and the talk of secession at the South; but when the telegraph announced that the United States flag had been fired on in Charleston Harbor, he roused up, presided at a public meeting of his fellow citizens, instructed them how to organize themselves into a company of soldiers, and went along with them to Springfield. In due time he was made colonel of a regiment of volunteers, conducted it to Missouri, and in December, 1861, reached Cairo, Illinois. His career from that day to this is familiar to every school-boy in the land. He moved in co-operation with the gun-boat fleet up the Tennessee to Fort Henry, which was captured; to Fort Donelson, where a fortified place with its entire garrison of 17,000 men surrendered without conditions; then on to Shiloh, where one of the bloodiest and most successful battles of the war was fought, which first convinced our Southern brethren, who had been taught that one Southern man was equal to five Yankees, that man to man was all they wanted—then Vicksburg, Chattanooga, everywhere victorious, everywhere successful, fulfilling the wise conclusion of Mr. Lincoln that he wanted "military success." Then he was called for the first time in his life to Washington to command an army of perfect strangers, under new conditions, and in a strange country. Casting his thoughts over a continent, giving minute instructions for several distinct armies from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, himself assuming the hardest share, he began a campaign equal in strategy, in logistics, and in tactics to any of Napoleon, and grander than any ever contemplated by England. His personal action in crossing the Rapidan in the face of Lee's army, fighting him in the Wilderness, "forward by the left flank," to Spottsylvania, to Richmond, and Petersburg, was the sublimity of heroism. Of course, he had a superiority of numbers and resources, but nothing like the disproportion stated by General Wolseley. At Vicksburg he began in May, 1863, the movement with less numbers than Pemberton surren-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dered to him along with Vicksburg in July. At Chattanooga he attacked his enemy in the strongest position possible; so strong, indeed, that Bragg, a most thorough and intelligent soldier, regarded it as unassailable, and had detached Longstreet's corps to Knoxville, of which mistake Grant took prompt advantage, and I never heard before that Bragg thought the pursuit after his defeat was not quick and good enough to suit him; and, finally, when Lee was forced to flee from his intrenchments at Richmond and Petersburg by Sheridan's bold and skillful action at Five Forks, I believe it is conceded that the pursuit by Sheridan and Grant was so rapid that Lee was compelled to surrender his whole army. Grant's "strategy" embraced a continent, Lee's a small State; Grant's "logistics" were to supply and transport armies thousands of miles, where Lee was limited to hundreds. Grant had to conquer natural obstacles as well as hostile armies, and a hostile people; his "tactics" were to fight wherever and whenever he could capture or cripple his adversary and his resources; and when Lee laid down his arms and surrendered, Grant, by the stroke of his pen, on the instant gave him and his men terms so liberal as to disarm all criticism. Between these two men as generals I will not institute a comparison, for the mere statement of the case establishes a contrast.

I offer another name more nearly resembling General Lee in personal characteristics, General George H. Thomas, probably less known in England, but who has a larger following and holds a higher place in the hearts and affections of the American people than General Lee. He, too, was a Virginian, and when Lee resigned from the army in 1861, Thomas succeeded him as Colonel of the Second Regular Cavalry. A graduate of West Point of the class of 1840, who had served his country in the Florida War, in the Mexican War, and in campaigns against hostile Indians, rising with honor and credit through all the grades, at each stage taking the usual oath to defend the United States against all her enemies whatsoever, foreign and domestic. When the storm of civil war burst on our country, unlike Lee, he resolved to stand by his oath and to fight against his native State, to maintain the common union of our fathers. In personal appearance he resembled George Washington, the father of our country, and in all the attributes of manhood he was the peer of General Lee, as good, if not a better, soldier, of equal intelligence,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same kind heart, beloved to idolatry by his Army of the Cumberland, exercising a gentle, but strict, discipline, never disturbed by false rumors or real danger, not naturally aggressive, but magnificent on the defensive; almost the very counterpart of his friend, General Lee, but far excelling him in the moral and prtriotic line of action at the beginning of the war. Lee resigned his commission when civil war was certain, but Thomas remained true to his oath and his duty, always, to the very last minute of his life.

During the whole war his services were transcendent, winning the first substantial victory at Mill Springs in Kentucky, January 20th, 1862, participating in all the campaigns of the West in 1862–3–4, and finally, December 16th, 1864, annihilating the army of Hood, which in mid winter had advanced to Nashville to besiege him. In none of these battles will General Wolseley pretend there was such inequality of numbers as he refers to in the East.

I now quote from General Garfield's eloquent tribute of respect to his comrade, and commander General George H. Thomas, addresed to the Army of the Cumberland at Cleveland, Ohio, on the 25th of November, 1870, shortly after the General's death, which tribute has gone into recorded history, never to be effaced:

"When men shall read the history of battles, they will never fail to study and admire the work of Thomas during that afternoon (at Chickamauga, September 20th, 1863). With but twenty-five thousand men, formed in a semi-circle, of which he, himself, was the centre and soul, he successfully resisted for more than five hours the repeated assaults of an army of sixty-five thousand men, flushed with victory and bent on his annihilation.

"Towards the close of the day his ammunition began to fail. One by one of his Division Commanders reported but ten rounds, five rounds, and two rounds left. The calm, quiet answer was returned, 'Save your fire for close quarters, and when your last shot is fired give them the bayonet.' On a portion of his line the last assault was repelled by the bayonet, and several hundred rebels were captured. When night had closed over the combatants, the last sound of battle was the booming of Thomas' shells bursting among his baffled and retreating assailants.

"He was indeed the Rock of Chickamauga, against which the wild waves of battle dashed in vain. It will stand forever in the annals of his country that there he saved from destruction the *Army of the Cumberland*. He held the road to Chattanooga. The campaign was successful. The gate of the mountains was ours."

Nashville, on the 15th and 16th of December, 1864, was General Thomas's most important battle, where he was in supreme command—of which General Garfield says:

"Nashville was the only battle of our war which anuihilated an army. Hood

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crossed the Tennessee late in November, and moved northward with an army of fifty-seven thousand veterans. Before the end of December twenty-five thousand of that number were killed, wounded, or captured. Thousands more had deserted, and the rabble that followed him back to the south was no longer an army.

"In summing up the qualities of General Thomas it is difficult to find his exact parallel in history. His character as a man and a soldier was unique. In some respects he resembled Zachary Taylor, and many of his solid qualities as a soldier were developed by his long service under that honest and sturdy soldier.

"In patient attention to all the details of duty, in the thoroughness of organization, equipment, and discipline of his troops, and in the powerful grasp by which he held and wielded his army, he was not unlike, and fully equaled, Wellington.

"The language applied to the Iron Duke by the historian of the Peninsular War might almost be for a description of Thomas. Napier says: 'He had his army in hand, keeping it, with unmitigated labor, always in a fit state to march or to fight. Sometimes he was indebted to fortune, sometimes to his natural genius, always to his untiring industry; for he was emphatically a painstaking man.'

"The language of Lord Brougham addressed to Wellington is a fitting description of Thomas:

"'Mighty Captain! who never advanced except to cover his arms with glory; mightier Captain! who never retreated except to eclipse the glory of his advance.'

"If I remember correctly, no enemy was ever able to fight Thomas out of any position he ever undertook to hold.

"On the whole, I cannot doubt that the most fitting parallel to General Thomas is found in our greatest American, the man who was 'first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.' The personal resemblance of General Thomas to Washington was often the subject of remark. Even at West Point Rosecrans was accustomed to call him General Washington.

"He resembled Washington in the gravity and dignity of his character, in the solidity of his judgment, in the careful accuracy of all his transactions, in the incorruptible integrity, in his extreme but unaffected modesty.

"Though his death was most sudden and unexpected, all his official papers and his accounts with government were in perfect order and ready for instant settlement. His reports and official correspondence were models of pure style and full of valuable details. Even during the exciting and rapid campaign from Chattanooga to Atlanta, he recorded each month the number of rounds his men had fired, and other similar facts concerning the equipment and condition of his army.

"His modesty was as real as his courage. When he was in Washington, in 1861, his friends, with great difficulty, persuaded him to allow himself to be introduced to the House of Representatives. He was escorted to the Speaker's stand, while the great Assembly of Representatives and citizens arose and greeted him with the most enthusiastic marks of affection and reverence. Mr. Speaker Colfax, in speaking of it afterward, said:

"I noticed, as he stood beside me, that his hand trembled like an aspen leaf. He could bear the shock of battle, but he shrank from the storm of applause.

"He was not insensible to praise; and he was quick to feel any wrong or injustice. While grateful to his country for the honor it conferred on him, and while cherishing all expression of affection on the part of his friends, he would not accept the smallest token of regard in the form of a gift.

"So frank and guileless was his life, so free from anything that approached intrigue, that when, after his death, his private letters and papers were examined,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there was not a scrap among them that his most confidential friends thought best to destroy.

"When Phidias was asked why he took so much pains to finish up the parts of his statute that would not be in sight, he said, 'These I am finishing for the gods to look at.' In the life and character of General Thomas there were no secret places of which his friends will ever be ashamed.

"But his career is ended. Struck dead at his post of duty, a bereaved nation bore his honored dust across the continent and laid it at rest on the banks of the Hudson, amidst the grief and tears of millions. The nation stood at his grave as a mourner. No one knew till he was dead how strong was his hold on the hearts of the American people. Every citizen felt that a pillar of state had fallen, that a great and true and pure man had passed from earth.

"There are no fitting words in which I may speak of the loss which every member of this society has sustained in his death.

"The General of the army has beautifully said in his order announcing the death of General Thomas:

"Though he leaves no child to bear his name, the old Army of the Cumberland, numbered by tens of thousands, called him father, and will weep for him in tears of manly grief.

"To us, his comrades, he has left the rich legacy of his friendship. To his country and to mankind he has left his character and his fame as a priceless and everlasting possession.

"O iron nerve, to true occasion true!
O fallen at length that tower of strength,
Which stood four square to all the winds that blew!
His work is done.
But while the races of mankind endure,
Let his great example stand,
Colossal sun of every land,
And keep the soldier firm, the statesman pure,
Till in all lands, and thro' all human story,
The path of duty be the way to Glory."

Such was the testimony of Garfield, who stood by his side midst carnage and slaughter, the same Gen. James A. Garfield, who afterwards was elected by an overwhelming majority of the American people to be their Chief Magistrate and President.

Let me now quote from another equally distinguished soldier and statesman, U. S. Grant, of world-wide fame. General Grant always manifested the greatest affection, love, and respect for his senior in years and service, General Thomas, but just before the really great battle of Nashville, as critical and important to America as was that of Waterloo to Europe, General Grant, in Virginia, having absolute command of all the armies of the Union, became impatient with what he thought "slowness" on the part of Thomas. After several telegrams pro and con, he made a conditional order to supersede him, which never went into effect, because events fully justified Thomas. But on pages 295 and 296,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume 2, of John Russell Young's "Around the World with General Grant" will be found:

"This led to some talk about Thomas. The General (Grant) said: I yield to no man in my admiration of Thomas. He was a fine character, all things considered—his relations with the South, his actual sympathies, and his fervent loyalty—one of the finest characters of the war. I was fond of him, and it was a severe trial for me even to think of removing him. I mention that fact to show the extent of my own anxiety about Sherman and Hood. But Thomas was an inert man. It was this slowness that led to the stories that he meant to go with the South. When the war was coming Thomas felt like a Virginian, and talked like one, and had all the sentiment then so prevalent about the rights of slavery and sovereign States, and so on. But the more Thomas thought it over, the more he saw the crime of treason behind it all, and to a mind as honest as that of Thomas, the crime of treason would soon appear. So, by the time Thomas thought it all out, he was as passionate and angry in his love for the Union as any one. So he continued during the war. As a commander he was slow. We used to say, laughingly, 'Thomas is too slow to move and too brave to run away.' The success of his campaign (Nashville) will be his vindication, even against my criticisms.

"That success and all the fame that came with it belong to Thomas. When I wrote my final report at the close of the war I wrote fourteen or fifteen pages criticising Thomas, and my reasons for removing so distinguished a commander. But I suppressed that part. I have it among my papers and mean to destroy it. I do not want to write anything that might even be construed into a reflection upon Thomas. We differed about the Nashville campaign, but there could be no difference as to the effects of the battle. Thomas died suddenly, very suddenly. He was sitting in his office, I think, at Headquarters (San Francisco), when he fell back unconscious. He never rallied. I remember Sherman coming to the White House in a state of deep emotion with a dispatch, saying, 'I am afraid old Tom is gone.' The news was a shock and a grief to us both. In an hour we learned of his death. The cause was fatty degeneration of the heart, if I remember. I have often thought that this disease, with him long-seated, may have led to the inertness which affected him as a commander.

. . . "I have no doubt if the truth were known, the disease from which Thomas died demanded from him constant fortitude, and affected his actions in the field. Nothing would be more probable. Thomas is one of the great names of our history, one of the greatest heroes of our war, a rare and noble character in every way worthy of his fame."

In this same volume, pages 458–460, will be found General Grant's estimate of General Lee, told in the same informal, conversational style:

"I never ranked Lee as high as some others of the army—that is to say, I never had as much anxiety when he was in my front as when Joe Johnston was in front. Lee was a good man, a fair commander, who had everything in his favor. He was a man who needed sunshine. He was supported by the unanimous voice of the South, he was supported by a large party in the North. He had the support and sympathy of the outside world. All this is of immense advantage to a general. Lee had this in a remarkable degree. Everything he did was right. He was treated like a demi-god. Our generals had a hostile press, lukewarm friends, and a public opinion outside. The cry was in the air that the North only won by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brute force, that the generalship and valor were with the South. This has gone into history with so many other illusions that are historical. Lee was of a slow, conservative, cautious nature, without imagination or humor, always the same, with grave dignity. I never could see in his achievements what justifies his reputation. The illusion that nothing but heavy odds beat him will not stand the ultimate light of history. I know it is not true. Lee was a good deal of a headquarters general, a desk general, from what I can hear, and from what his officers say. He was almost too old for active service—the best service in the field. At the time of the surrender he was fifty-eight or fifty-nine, and I was forty-three. His officers used to say that he posed himself, that he was retiring and exclusive, and that his headquarters were difficult of access."

Many of us believe that, had Lee stood firm in 1861, and used his personal influence, he could have stayed the Civil War, and thereby saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of the fairest youth of the land, and thousands of millions of dollars in cost and destruction; but since the public mind has settled to the conclusion that the institution of slavery was so interwoven in our system that nothing but the interposition of Providence and horrid war could have eradicated it, and now that it is in the distant past, and that we as a nation, North and South, East and West, are the better for it, we believe that the war was worth to us all it cost in life and treasure. We who fought on the right side are perfectly willing to let this conclusion remain, but when the question of honor to the memory of our dead heroes is raised at home or abroad, we will fight with pen and speech to secure for our Grant, Thomas, Meade, McPherson, Hancock, Mower, Logan, Blair, and a hundred others who were true and faithful, brave and competent, every honor a nation can afford to bestow.

I know full well that it was the fashion in England, during the dark days of our Rebellion, to consider the leaders at the South as heroes contending for freedom, for home and fireside, whereas we of the North were invaders, barbarians, "Huns and Goths," rude and unlettered. This was not true, and every American may, with pride and satisfaction, turn to Mr. Lincoln's first inaugural address; to the glorious uprising of our whole people, who had been engaged in peaceful pursuits, to assume the novel character of soldier; whose leaders emerged from the great mass by the process of nature; who gradually, from books and actual experience, learned the science of war, and so applied its rules as to subdue a rebellion against the national authority by one-third of our people, a feat never before accomplished on earth; who, at the conclusion of hostilities, granted terms to the van-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quished so generous and magnanimous as to command the admiration of mankind; and then quietly returned to their homes to resume their old occupations of peace. England, and even some of our Eastern States seem not to realize that the strength of our country lies west of the Alleghanies. They still see only the war in Virginia, and, at furthest, Gettysburg. The Civil War was concluded when Vicksburg, Chattanooga, and Atlanta fell. After these it only remained to dispose of Lee's army, which was promptly and scientifically done. Had General Wolseley met General Thomas at Chattanooga in 1864, his quick, discerning mind would have reached another conclusion. He would have doubted whether a single corps of English troops, with the best staff which Aldershot turns out, could have turned the scale after the year 1862.

Of all governments on earth, England is the last to encourage rebellion against lawful authority, and, of all men in England, General Lord Wolseley is the last who should justify and uphold treason. Ireland, to-day, has many times the cause to rebel against England which the South had in 1861, and when some future Emmet manifests the transcendent qualities which scintillate and sparkle in the Irish character, and some enthusiastic American applauds him, and awards him national honors, then will General Wolseley, or his successor in office, understand the feelings of us in America, who, though silent, watch the world's progress toward the conclusion in which truth and justice must stand triumphant over treachery and wrong.

When the time comes to award monuments for service in the Civil war, the American people will be fully prepared to select the subjects without hint or advice from abroad.

W. T. SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MY PUBLIC LIFE, BY PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

DIRECTLY after the nomination of General Garfield for the Presidency, it was arranged between him and me that I should write a life of him, to be published by the Messrs. Harper & Brothers. I had then been on intimate terms with the General for all of seventeen years, during nearly the whole of which time I had been gathering material for a biography of him, to be written at some subsequent period; but when I set about the actual writing of the book, I found that my work would be greatly facilitated if it had his active help and supervision. Accordingly, I went to his home at Mentor, Ohio, submitted to him the proofs of what I had already written, and secured from him such additional facts as seemed to be necessary. These facts he communicated to me orally, in the presence of a stenographer, who took down his every word as it was uttered. The substance of a part of what he then dictated—but not the whole—was incorporated into the life that I wrote; but it is thought that an exact report of all that he said may be of interest to the public. It is consequently here given, in his own language, and without any alteration from the colloquial style in which it was delivered. The only change I have felt at liberty to make in the stenographic report, has been the striking out of some of the questions by which I led him upon different branches of his subject.

EDMUND KIRKE.

I.

CONGRESSIONAL CAREER.

When I went into Congress the war was still raging. I wanted to go back into the army. After Rosecrans's removal, Thomas, who was a very dear friend of mine, was exceedingly anxious to have me come back, and tendered me in a private letter the command of an army corps if I would go. He had become the head of the whole army, you know. I very much wanted to go back, but Mr. Lincoln made a personal point [of my taking my seat in the House of Representatives]. In the first place, he said that the Republican majority in Congress was very small, and there was great doubt whether we could certainly carry the necessary measures; and in the next place, he was greatly lacking in men of military experience in the House, to regulate the legisla-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion about the army. So I went in, and was immediately put upon the Military Committee.

In time of peace Ways and Means and Appropriations are the most important of the committees, and the Military is rather a decoration than an influential committee. But in the war the Military Committee was 'way up above any others in importance, and my position on it, as practically acquainted with the wants of the army, called me into immediate requisition, giving me a prominence in the House in the beginning that I could not possibly have had in any other way. The first speech I made was on the 26th of January, 1864, on a bill for the confiscation of rebel property. There are portions of that which you will probably think it best to print, enough, at least, to show the swing of my mind, and the character of my speaking. I was the youngest member in either branch of Congress at that time, as I had been the youngest member of the Ohio Legislature, and the youngest Brigadier General in the army. That speech is probably an exhibition of what I was when I got there, and it shows my growth at that time.

Then immediately followed the great war legislation—the question was whether we should continue the work of offering large bounties, and getting bounty-jumpers and poor fellows. When they were passing a bill to offer more bounties, I voted alone on the ayes and noes against it, to the amazement of everybody who wanted to be friendly with the soldiers. The reason I assigned was that the policy was ruinous, would not get us more men, and would simply cost us money. In a crisis like that, I said, the nation had a right to the service of its children; and it had a right, therefore, and it was its duty by the strong arm of the law and the draft, to put just as many citizens into the field as it needed. A few months afterwards, when the bounty system actually broke down, the whole Congress came to my view.

In the course of that Congress I made a speech in favor of a draft law. We were in a desperate strait. It was a very solemn moment. Mr. Lincoln came to the Committee, and told us, what we did not dare to tell the House, that in so many months, not far ahead, the term of 380,000 men would expire. The army was about three-quarters of a million, and the term of enlistment of nearly one-half—say, forty per cent.—would expire in about a hundred days. "Now," he said, "unless I can replace those men, we not only cannot push this Rebellion, but we cannot even stand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where we are; Sherman will have to come back from Atlanta, and McClellan retire from the Peninsula; and I ask you to give me power to fill the ranks."

His Republican friends expostulated with him; said that it was right on the eve of his re-election, and that the country would not stand it; that men who had already paid large sums in bounties, to get men to serve in their stead,—and to raise the quotas of different places,—would not now submit to be drafted; that it would raise a storm and tempest, and the Democracy would carry the country. Mr. Lincoln raised himself up to his full height, as he answered: "It is not necessary for me to be re-elected; but it is necessary that I should put down this Rebellion. Give me that law, and I will put it down before my successor takes his seat."

Thereupon we took a bill for a draft into the House, and it was defeated two to one—all the Democrats and enough of our people to make a two-thirds opposition voted it down. I moved to reconsider the vote, and made a speech, which has never been printed in pamphlet form, but can be found in the *Congressional Globe*, sometime in the Thirty-eighth Congress—I think in the month of July, 1864. In it I said to the House that, in my judgment, they had voted to abandon the contest and give up the Union; and I went on to show them how they were doing it.

Question.—"Did you carry the draft law on this reconsideration?"

Answer.—We carried the draft law on that reconsideration; and Lincoln drafted for 500,000 men.

Question.—"Then it was in consequence of your motion that the law was carried?"

Answer.—I can't take the entire credit of it, because General Schenck was the Chairman of the Committee; but I stood in the breach, and made a large number whose re-election was then pending furious. They feared that if they voted for it they might have to face an angry constituency. I made myself then somewhat unpopular by a rather reckless defiance of opinion in the House, so determined was I to see the thing through successfully. I could not see how men could value their political lives a moment in such a crisis. After a debate of several weeks the draft was carried; and the former law, which permitted commutation in money instead of service under the draft, was repealed by a vote of one hundred to fifty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After my vote and speech against the bounty law, I received a petition, signed by a number of prominent persons in my district, demanding my resignation, and withdrawing their confidence from me because I had gone against the soldiers and the bounty. I replied to them that I had acted according to my best judgment of the needs of the country, was sorry that it did not agree with theirs, but as between their opinion and my own, I was compelled to follow my own, and I expected to live till they confessed to me that I was right and they were wrong. Before many years I had letters from every signer of that petition expressing regret that he had signed it, and saying he then saw I was right.

The Rebellion was just dying when the Thirty-eighth Congress expired, on the 4th of March, 1865. When the Thirty-ninth Congress assembled in December, 1865, the Speaker of the House [Colfax] came to me, and asked if I had any request to make about the make-up of the committees; and I surprised him by saying that I had one, and that was that I might be left off the Military Committee. The war was over, but it was still an immense committee, because the war had to be settled, the army reorganized, rank adjusted, and all that sort of thing. It was considered as by all odds the post affording the most brilliant opportunity.

"Well," he said, "that is the most remarkable request I ever heard; but if you don't want the post, there are dozens back from the war who do? What do you want?"

I said, "I would like to go on a committee where I can study finance. That is soon to be the great question in this country."

I went on the Ways and Means just when we were beginning to handle those great dry questions of detail about tariff, taxation, currency, and the public debt, and I then laid myself out to study very thoroughly the history of English finance during the Napoleonic wars. I went over the speeches and the writers of that time, and then traced the subject through our own Revolutionary time, Hamilton's time, and Jackson's time until I had made a very thorough study of it, taking copious notes of what I read as I went along. I kept very quiet for a time while studying these subjects, but, at last, in 1866, I broke ground with a speech in favor of returning to specie payments.

About that time the Committee of Ways and Means was divided into three committees—Ways and Means proper, Appropriations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Banking and Currency, and I was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The great currency struggle—the beginning of Greenbackism, or rather of inflation—came then. It was while I was Chairman of that Committee that the "Black Friday" occurred—the great gold panic. The House directed my Committee to investigate it, and I went to New York to see if I could set forces to work to grapple with those gold gamblers, and get hold of the conspiracy. When I thought I had mastered the elements, I returned to Washington, and summoned man by man the witnesses I wanted, took their testimony, and wrote the report myself.

In the next Congress, I was made Chairman of the Committee of Appropriations, and I held that for four years. All the expenditures of the Government are passed upon by that Committee. On the subject of appropriations I made a speech, in 1872, entitled "Revenues and Expenditures," which, whatever I may say about it myself, others said was the first interesting speech that was ever made on that subject. That is, I made what they call in Parliament a "budget speech," in which I gave the philosophy of expenditures and appropriations, and forecasted, among other things, at what time in our history we could reach a peace level of expenditures—at what time we could get down so low that we could not get any lower, and the natural growth of the country would require a rise again; and in forecasting the time I took an immense risk in saying that "at a certain period, so far ahead, it will be found that we shall touch bottom on the scale of reduction, and at that time we shall probably get our interest down to *such* a figure, and, thereupon and thereafter, the growth of the country will make the peace-increase, starting up again, necessary." The period I fixed was about the end of 1876. I wrote an article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW about a year ago on appropriations [No. 271, June, 1879]. In that I quote a passage from this speech, and compare it with the facts to show how near I came to being correct. It was so accurate as to be almost startling. The only difference was it came about a year later than the time I had fixed; the figures were almost identical. I made this discovery as the result of an immense induction of reading, that the expenditures of a war could not be reduced so as to strike a peace level until a period after the war twice the length of the war itself. I showed that it was so in England's wars, and that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it was so in all our wars from the beginning; that the expenditures rose to their height, of course, at the close of the war. Then they began to drop, drop, drop, and to slope down in an inclined plane, until they struck the new level of peace, where the rise began again, gradually, and that they struck it at a period twice as long after the war as the length of the war itself. Our war was substantially five years long, ending, financially, in 1866. Add ten years, and you get to 1876, and I said, "We shall reach our peace level then." I analyzed, showing what were our war expenses, and the expenses resulting from the war, and the expenses of peace, showing that the peace expenses would increase all the time, growing with the growth of the country, and the war expenses decrease. There were two processes; but the war was so big that its decrease would be more rapid than the peace increase; and by and by those two lines would meet, and the sloping incline of peace would come. I got a theory upon it, and ventured to present it, and time showed my theory to be correct.

I had served four years on the Committee on Appropriations when the Democrats came into power in the House. I was put, of course, into the minority, and almost immediately there arose the Jeff. Davis amnesty debate—whether Jeff. Davis should be amnestied with the rest. Blaine made a speech against it, and Ben Hill made a terrific onslaught upon Blaine. I followed, and replied to Hill. That reply made a good deal of impression on the country at that time. I suppose there were millions of those speeches circulated in the campaign that fall. Near the close of that session of Congress, Lamar, who is a very brilliant man, made a carefully prepared speech, showing why the Democratic party ought to be put in power at the next election, and arraigning the Republican party. That speech was delayed until within two or three days of the adjournment of Congress. The word was passed around, and it was understood among them that Lamar was going to make a speech which would be a great campaign speech, and was to deliver it so late that it could not be replied to. The moment he sat down I rose, and got the floor. It was late in the afternoon, and the House adjourned, but I had the right to the floor the next morning. His speech was withheld, and did not appear in the *Record*, so that I could not see the full speech. I heard it, and had taken notes, and there was a brief summary in the morning dispatches. I rose and delivered this speech of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

August 4th, 1876, under the caption, "Can the Democratic party be safely intrusted with the administration of the Government?" I suppose on some accounts that is one of the best speeches I ever made. I think it had more effect, perhaps, on the country. It was made without much preparation. Of course, I worked pretty much all night in preparing the points. But that speech shows my feeling toward the South. I think one of generosity, and yet one of determined, stalwart Republicanism. I think you will find that speech one that you will want to quote largely from, and, perhaps, entire.

Then the electoral count came up. Now, it is said I went down to New Orleans as a "visiting statesman." I went down there, and when Mr. Potter afterwards came to make his investigation he found no fault whatever with me in his report. Nobody charged that I did or said any unjust or unfair thing. What I did was to examine very carefully the testimony in relation to the election in one parish, West Feliciana, and to write out a careful, brief, and judicial statement of the official testimony as to the conduct of the election there, and bring out my conclusions, which formed a part of the general report; but my report on West Feliciana was written separately. In it I analyze the Kuklux Rifle Club's movements in that parish, which broke up the election, and I confine myself to that; and I stand on everything I did there as being straight, and true, and fair, and I would stand by it any time.

When we got back and the electoral count came up, there was an effort made finally to make this Electoral Commission on the assumption that the Vice-President had not the right to count the vote, but that Congress had the right to count it. I made a speech on the electoral count January 25th, 1877, in which I took the ground that the Vice-President had the right under the Constitution to count the vote; that Congress was a usurper when it undertook to count it; that Congress was present only as a witness of a great solemn ceremony, but not as an actor; and I voted against the bill establishing the Electoral Commission, and this speech was leveled against it. I was opposed to it on principle.

Question.—"Was the Electoral Bill a suggestion of the Democrats?"

Answer.—Certainly, Henry B. Payne was one of the Com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittee. Well, I don't know as I should say it was a suggestion of the Democrats. It may have been suggested by McCreery, of Iowa. He was one of the Committee that got up the bill, but the Democrats joined heartily; came out and said it was a high patriotic thing to do. It afterwards turned out that they supposed they had got it fixed so that Judge Davis, who had really turned Democrat from being a Republican, would hold the casting vote. Payne afterwards admitted in a speech in Cleveland, that they never would have passed the Electoral Bill if they had supposed Judge Davis would not be on the Commission; but just as the Commission was about to be selected from the Supreme Court, Illinois elected Davis as Democratic Senator, and thereupon it became improper to choose him as a representative of the bench; and they put on the two out and out Democrats that were there, and the three other judges, and those three were Republicans. Well, the Lord came in, you know, just at the proper moment, and removed from the bench just the one man that the Democrats had relied on for the casting vote. Although I had voted against the Electoral Bill, and spoken against it, yet, when it was by common opinion decided that the Republicans should have two from the House, and the Democrats three, the Republicans met and unanimously chose me as the man to represent them; and then they chose Mr. Hoar. "Well, now," I said, "you have appointed me to serve in this capacity. I can serve on a committee, though I don't believe in its validity." And I did my duty on it. You will find in the volume that records the electoral count, the proceedings of the Commission, which you will find in the Astor Library, as part of the records of the *Globe*,—only in a separate volume. You will find there two opinions delivered by me in my capacity as Commissioner which you had better look over. You may want to print some of them.

Then, when Hayes came in, there was that tremendous row in our own party—division from Hayes. Then the attempt of the Potter Committee to investigate Hayes's title and to turn him out; and in that we had some fiery talking. In there came a speech on "Louisiana and Pacification."

I held the rôle then of trying to protect our party from splitting; and being the acknowledged leader of the House, I did it by keeping our people for six months from having a caucus, except to meet and choose officers, or something of that sort—from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having a sentimental caucus at all. I ought to say that as soon as Blaine left for the Senate, I was every time after that unanimously nominated for Speaker of the House by the Republicans and voted for by them. I was voted for three times as Speaker, once after Kerr died and Randall was elected for the short term, then when Randall was elected for the long term, and then for the second term.

The tendency of a part of our party to assail Hayes, and denounce him as a traitor, and a man who was going to Johnsonize the party, was very strong; and his defenders were comparatively few for a little while; but we agreed, a number of us, that we would prevent a row in the party by not having a caucus on any question; and we did not have one until Potter made his motion for an investigation of Hayes's title. That united the party almost immediately. Then we called a caucus denouncing the Potter investigation as revolutionary, and we worked harmoniously together, and you have seen how Hayes at last has been restored to the confidence of his party. My work as a pacificator of the party was very effective, and my speech on "Louisiana Affairs, and the Policy of Pacification," you will find here, dated February 19th, 1878.

Then, during the whole of 1878, came the resumption struggle, when the Democrats tried to repeal the law of resumption. About the last thing, you know, the Republicans did before they went out of power was to pass the resumption law—the law nearly four years in advance, so as to get ready for it. Of course, the Democrats said it could not be done. Speeches were delivered, essays were written, and reports were made, to show it could not be done. Tilden, in his letter of acceptance, had denounced the Republican party for not having accumulated a reserve of coin for resumption—as much as to say, "Put us into power, and we will resume." Then we passed the law, and got started on it. Then the Democrats denounced us for hoarding gold, and said we could not resume. When a man failed anywhere he was "Sherman's victim,"—"the victim of the Republican party." The papers were full of it. Those terrible times fell upon us; and during the whole of the time they continued to denounce us as the cause of their woe. During all that time I stood up and made no concession anywhere.

Then came the silver fight with all its ferocity, and in a circle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of nine States around Ohio and including Ohio, I was the only man on either side that voted against the silver bill. All the rest were for trying unlimited silver. I was not opposed to silver, only I wanted it silver that would be equal in value with gold, so that every dollar should be equal before the law. We reached it finally by modification—not unlimited silver, but keeping within limits of so much a month; and we thus, by having the limitation put on, saved it from utter ruin.

Then came the extra session, and the fight against the election law. You have my volume of speeches on the election law. These are pretty full, and explain themselves. Probably the most effective speeches I have made are there.

Then, on the tariff, there is a speech delivered in March, 1878, that you have not here. That is my fullest speech on the tariff. I went into Congress from an iron district. There are nineteen iron furnaces in my district and a great many rolling mills. My studies led me to believe that, as a mere matter of abstract theory, the doctrine of free trade was the true doctrine; but that, in a country situated as ours is, free trade was not the thing that could practically work at all, only as we came up to it, through a long series of protections, until, one by one, the various articles of manufacture were so on their feet that they could be liberated and stand the strain alone. In 1866 I made a speech, which you will find in the *Record*, and from which I quote in some of my other speeches, taking the position that I was in favor of that sort of protection that would ultimately lead to liberating, one by one, the articles of free trade; that I was opposed to prohibitory protection, but was in favor of a tariff high enough for our people fairly to compete and keep the national industries alive, but not so high as to enable the manufacturers to combine and monopolize prices and have no competition from abroad. On that doctrine I launched myself. That doctrine was not satisfactory to the free traders, because they wanted free trade right along, nor was it satisfactory to the extreme protectionists, because they wanted to make just as much money as they could by having the highest possible tariff, and having a monopoly of the business. I was, therefore, denounced by the extreme protectionists as a free trader, and by the free traders as a sort of protectionist. It is the only position in my life where I have stood in the middle between two extremes. I have usually been at one pole or the other. There I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood on the equator, and there insisted that the true doctrine was the point of stable equilibrium, where you could hold a tariff that would not be knocked down every time the free traders got into power and boosted up when the protectionists got into power, but to give the country a stable policy, where the tendency would be toward amelioration all the while. I have held that equitable ground all through, and held it against assaults, now from one side, now from the other, and I esteem it one of the greatest of my achievements in statesmanship to have held that equipoise. You will find the theory of it fully summed up in the speech delivered in March, 1878, covering the whole subject. There is a speech here, made in 1870, on the tariff. The historical part of it is the best thing of its kind I have ever done ; that is, the part where I state the policy of England toward the United States, which led to the Revolution, showing how they had made us to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, mere subjects and labor operatives for England. That part of it you will do very well to draw on.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMERCIAL EDUCATION.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the training of a young merchant differed in principle scarcely at all from the training of a young mechanic. In those days the merchant lived above his shop or warehouse, and his clerks and other employés formed part of his family. The youth who entered a merchant's counting-room was regularly apprenticed, and wore the apprentice's garb. He took his meals at his employer's table, and lived in his house, and was expected to render him and the family domestic services, which now are demanded from servants only.

But he had many advantages. He knew all the details of his master's business; he sat or waited at the board when his master entertained his customers or fellow-merchants, and heard their conversation; and he was present at the confidential talk of the family in a time when men did not leave their business behind them when they went to dinner. He was far more his master's companion than a junior clerk or office-boy could possibly be now. He accompanied him to carry parcels or messages when he went on 'Change or to the wharves, or escorted him at night with a lantern and the thick club, the special weapon of the London 'prentice.

His master was not only the guardian of his morals and behavior, but his daily instructor; sometimes with thrifty old saws and proverbs, such as "waste not, want not," "keep thy shop and thy shop will keep thee," and sometimes with the practical wisdom derived from long experience and many dealings with the world. The youth was behind all the scenes and saw the great transactions as well as the small; he lived in an atmosphere of commerce. The dramatists have left us many quaint and pretty pictures of this homely and healthy atmosphere, in which grew up such "royal merchants" as Sir Thomas Gresham.

It would seem, if Freytag's pleasing novel, "Debit and Credit,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be a faithful picture, that something of the kind still survives, or did survive until recently, in some parts of Germany; but for England and America the conditions of modern life have changed all this, and made it no longer possible. The merchant's counting-room is a place for the transaction of business only; when business is over for the day he quits it. Many merchants dissociate their business affairs as much as possible from their home circle. Even their physicians warn them not to take their business home with them.

Again, the merchant has not to go about as he had to do two hundred years ago. He no longer has to run to the Rialto or on 'Change to learn news of foreign markets, or to the wharves to inquire of just-arrived sailors if his ships have been heard from. The post-office, the newspaper, and the telegraph keep him hourly advised of whatever concerns him. If a movement of Russia on the Black Sea is likely to send up the price of wheat, or the opening of fresh oil-wells on the Caspian to send down that of petroleum; if a ship of his has arrived safe at Marseilles, or foundered off Kittyhawk, he will learn it sooner at his own desk than anywhere else. He can, if it so please him, live with his head bookkeeper in an almost invisible world, ordering purchases and sales in distant markets, directing the movements of his ships, transferring values from point to point as his plans require, while not one of his immediate employés is in the secret of his operations, or sees but the smallest fraction of the energies he sets in action.

The ever-increasing preciousness of time is also changing the conditions of business. Nothing is more common than to see in business offices more or less courteous admonitions to the visitor to dispatch his business as briefly as possible and depart; that to rob a busy man of his time is to rob him of his money, and so forth. For this cause alone the merchant can no more explain to his clerks the principles of commerce than a general can lecture upon strategy on a field of battle; and his clerks would think he was out of his mind if he attempted it.

What this state of things may grow to be has been shown by Dickens in his "Dombey & Son." Young Walter Gay enters the great merchant's offices in the expectation of imbibing commercial knowledge at every pore, and rapidly rising by virtue of zeal, punctuality, and readiness to learn. But the business is all transacted in the rooms of the heads of the house; and his duties are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limited to carrying letters or keeping tally of casks or sacks delivered on the wharf.

Now, it is true that most of our merchants care far more for their employés, down to the very humblest, than did the haughty and indifferent Mr. Dombey; and yet it is no less true that the conditions of modern commerce,—the vastness of business, the specialization of departments, the value of time, the new methods of intercourse,—all tend in the direction of producing such a state of relations between employer and employed. The good merchant will reward faithful service liberally and beyond the contract; his hand will be open in cases of want, sickness, or distress among his employés; he will care for their reasonable recreation and rest—what money can properly do for them will be done; but beyond this how can he go?

A youth comes from college with a good record and enters a counting-house. His classics, his higher mathematics, his philosophy and history, which he has learned so zealously, seem to be of no use to him at all, and of that which he needs he knows next to nothing. The ability to write a German letter would be worth more to him than to know Plato by heart; to be able to make up a statement of general average would be better than having the calculus at his fingers' ends. The boy who has been in the office a year, who has never had more than the most elementary grammar-school education, seems to know a thousand things of which he knows nothing, and looks down upon him as an ignoramus. He must go to that boy to be taught, or get hints from good-natured clerks if they have time to teach him; and while he is thus picking up, in a hap-hazard way, the knowledge on which his success in life will depend, he, perhaps, regrets bitterly the years that, as he thinks, he has wasted at college.

To remedy this state of things business colleges have been established. I believe them to be, in many ways, of eminent service. Penmanship, book-keeping, business forms, the routine of banking, insurance, exchange, etc., are taught (and in the best of them more than these), so that the youth who passes from their course to the counting-house knows, at all events, the elements of his duties and the language of the place. And he has learned what he knows intelligently and systematically, which is an important thing; for as the educated engineer is superior to the ordinary mechanic, so is the merchant's clerk who has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

educated in a commercial college superior to one who has merely picked up his knowledge at random.

But what seems to me the defect of these colleges, as at present organized, is that they are too narrow. They may qualify a young man to be a good clerk, but they do not prepare him to be a merchant in the wider and nobler meaning of the word. They give a technical, but not a liberal, education. Now, a liberal education is one which enables a man to look beyond the limited horizon of his personal occupation and interests, and to have some intelligent comprehension of all matters which largely interest the men of his time. The man liberally educated is at home in any society, because no great domain of human thought and interest is absolutely alien to him. To him has been given the key of knowledge. More than ever before in the world's history is this liberality of education demanded when subjects which once were the mysteries of select bodies, the exclusive property of coteries, the arcana of the learned, are daily discussed in the newspapers and enter into the talk of society. There is not a daily paper of any consequence in the country whose first page does not presuppose a liberal education on the part of its readers, because without that it cannot be thoroughly understood.

Every merchant should know his business well, and go on enlarging his knowledge as does the man of science or the professional man; but if he knows nothing but his business, though he count his gain by millions, he is only a dealer in merchandise, perchance on a gigantic scale, and no merchant in the true sense of the word.

Daily and everywhere does commerce grow in importance and influence. Great questions involving the destinies of states and the welfare of nations, that once were decided on ecclesiastical or dynastic grounds, are now decided on commercial. At no period of the world's history, since Vasco da Gama discovered the maritime route to India, have the nations of the earth been so much occupied with questions of commercial power and aggrandizement as in the second half of this century. This movement began with the great international exhibition of 1851, when the world, so to speak, took stock of its own trade and stood amazed at its vastness.

Sir Walter Raleigh, in recommending a commercial policy for England, declared, "Whoso commands the sea, commands the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade of the world; and whoso commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world, and therefore the world itself." It was the trade of the world, and potentially the riches of the world that England looked at in that Aladdin's palace of crystal; nor did England alone look and learn. Other nations learned the lesson, and prepared to shape their policy accordingly, and back it up by fleets and armies.

Does anybody think that the Crimean War was fought about the "keys of the holy places?" No; it was for the keys of Europe's treasure-chest. Did Prussia seize the Baltic Provinces in the character of Don Quixote, redressing the wrongs of the shadowy Prince of Augustenburg? Prussia wanted ports on the Baltic. So with the war with Austria; nor need the world be surprised should Imperial Germany one of these days find some reason of state for seizing the ports of the Scheldt, where she will be able to float a mighty navy and a vast commercial marine at all seasons of the year. What draws Russia so irresistibly to Constantinople? A fantastic notion that it is her destiny to take up and complete the eastern conquests of the first Alexander, him of Macedon? No; but to have free outlet to the Mediterranean and the commerce of the world. Italy, the corpse, Japan, the mummy, touched by the vivifying finger of the commercial spirit, have risen to their feet; even China, the petrifaction, the fossil, gives signs of awakening.

Happily for the United States, the resources with which Providence has blessed us and our position on the map tend to make this ever more and more a commercial country, without the military necessities imposed upon others. We do not need to carry, like the old traders to Senegambia, our merchandise in one hand and a cocked musket in the other. We do not need to carve at the world's table "in gloves of steel," and "drink the red wine" of profit "through the helmet barred." Yet what are we doing to enable us to utilize our great advantages, and enter into successful competition with our active and intelligent rivals? Nothing whatever. The government is tardy in removing obstacles to the expansion of our foreign commerce, and regards with indifference, or lack of comprehension, what other nations are doing. Our consuls send home voluminous reports—some highly intelligent, and some ineffably stupid. They go to the government printer, and that is pretty much the end of them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Does any legislator ever take a hint from these reports prepared expressly for his information? We certainly see no signs of it in his legislation.

And this brings me back to the proper subject of this paper—the necessity for better commercial education. It is necessary, for one thing, that commercial interests may be better represented in our halls of legislature. I am far from insinuating disparagement of the noble profession of the law; but I cannot help thinking that if we had a few less lawyers and a few more merchants in our State assemblies and in Congress, the country would be much the better for it.

I need not specify measures; any intelligent business man who has watched the financial and economic legislation of Congress and of the States, has seen the blundering, the ignorance of the very fundamental principles of trade, has noted measures produced with triumphant assurance, and not seldom carried through, which were simply preposterous—measures which must inevitably fail in the object proposed, and were sometimes really hostile to it; measures self-contradictory and nugatory; measures which were certain to do tenfold as much harm as their advocates expected good from them; projects and devices which had been tried and exploded centuries ago—any one who has marked this cannot have failed to see how much mischief might have been prevented and how much good might have been done by a small body of intelligent business men who would examine such questions, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as business men simply, bringing the light of experience and matured judgment to bear upon them. Such a body of men would command more than respect; they would be an authority in their special sphere; and the country would be spared the incalculable loss and damage which arise from crippling and hampering trade, and the vain attempt to frustrate its natural laws; and it would be spared the shame of producing, in this nineteenth century, legislation worthy the dark ages. No one will deny that the great commercial panics of this country, which have wrought so much misery and so shaken the social fabric, owed their origin and their extent to a lack of proper commercial education among our young business men. The great problems with which the destinies of this country are involved, are, and must be, mainly economic; and with these the trained intellects of business men are best qualified to grapple. It will not be long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before this is universally seen and admitted, and hence I urge the necessity of providing better, fuller, and broader commercial education.

These facts have long been recognized abroad. In France, commercial colleges are in successful operation at Havre, Rouen, Lyons, Lille, Marseilles, and Bordeaux, and their value has been frequently attested by the Chambers of Commerce and municipal authorities of those cities, and by many educational bodies. Paris has the Ecole Spéciale de Commerce, under the control of the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, and it has done much in raising the whole standard of commercial education. Antwerp has a similar school of high reputation, known as the Commercial Institute, where students are instructed in book-keeping, trade forms, exchanges, the civil code, political economy, commercial history and geography, and the languages of commercial nations.

In some of the German States there are flourishing commercial schools. At Berlin, Leipzig, Nüremburg, Dresden, and elsewhere they exist in a high state of advancement. Still more distinguished schools of that character are those of Austria, located at Prague, Trieste, and Vienna. Among the most important of these is the Commercial Academy of Vienna, founded in 1857. It was established by a subscription fund of about $168,000, which has since been increased. It embraces a museum, in which are founded a chemical laboratory, technological collections, raw materials and manufactured articles of commerce, as guides to instruction. The faculty consists of twenty full professors, besides some special instructors. The two years study which constitute a course of instruction, embraces in the first division general arithmetic, physical geography, natural history, zoölogy, mineralogy, botany, physiology, calligraphy, primary book-keeping, and the languages of contiguous countries. With a fair knowledge of these, the student then branches into complex book-keeping, the more intricate branches of commercial arithmetic, foreign exchanges, commercial geography, international and commercial relations, political economy, counting-room practice, commercial technology, and a practical study of commercial values. More than five hundred students attend.

The great educational problem of the day is to combine breadth with specialization. The old college curriculum for all students is a thing of the past. Technical schools are too apt to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turn out specialists, but not educated men. To reconcile these needs the system of elective studies has been introduced into some of our colleges and universities, so adjusted that in each group special weight is laid upon certain studies, while these are supplemented by less thorough education in others.

In the Johns Hopkins University there are seven of these groups of studies, each of which groups comprises a complete curriculum, leads to the bachelor's degree, and gives the foundation of a liberal education.

Why might not this system be extended in that or other institutions of learning, so as to have a commercial course for young men intending to become merchants, which would be at once special and liberal, the students of which would be in no respect at a disadvantage compared with those of the other courses? Such a course might comprise penmanship, book-keeping, commercial forms and practice, such as banking, insurance, shipping, and railroading; principles of accounts, such as partnership settlements, adjustments of averages; English composition, with practice in writing business letters, drawing up reports; commercial law, with its forms and usages; drawing.

To these I would add elocution, to the extent, at least, to enable the student to address a public meeting or a board with ease, clearness, and fluency.

The student should also learn to speak and write French and German fluently, and should be taught the business forms and phrases. Opportunities might be provided for instruction in Portuguese and Spanish if desired. A movement is urged, with general approval, to largely extend our commercial relations with the Empire of Brazil, and the Central and South American States, but the advantages of preparatory instruction in the languages of those countries is hardly suggested, yet essentially necessary. The importance to a merchant of acquaintance with the languages of the countries he deals with is too much overlooked in England and America. In the *Spectator* (July 10, 1886), the writer, speaking of the rapidity with which Germany is gaining ground upon England in competition for the trade of Italy, says:

"The reason would seem to be a higher standard of technical education, greater activity in the employment of commercial travelers speaking Italian, greater attention paid to the wants of the Italian market. . . . German and French manufacturers are more in connection with importers than are British

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manufacturers. They send round numbers of commercial travelers who consult their wishes and communicate with them in Italian or French. German houses even correspond in Italian. All the Consuls agree that the use of the Italian language by Germans and the ignorance of it by Englishmen is the chief reason for the successful competition of Germany."

And the conclusion of the paper is so much to the point, that I make no apology for citing it in part:

"The English manufacturer must, in fact, display more intelligence, more adaptiveness, more energy, more sympathy, if he is to hold his own against the increasing rivalry of the highly educated, active, and expanding German. The first thing to do is to improve our commercial education. We must teach our boys the modern languages. Instead of giving them Shakespeare's knowledge of little Latin and less Greek, we must give them, as they do in Germany, a speaking as well as a grammatical acquaintance with the tongues of the peoples with whom they are to stand in commercial relations. In Germany, every boy intended for commerce learns English. In England, we should make every boy learn French and German."

In addition, lectures should be given on the history of trade and commerce, and its connection with political history; on commercial law and the principles of commercial legislation and political economy illustrated historically; on the general principles of law and the law of nations; on commercial geography, the great ports and markets of the world, the great routes of trade; and on the great staples of the world, with an account of their production and vent. This might be supplemented by a museum showing these great staples in the raw state and the various stages of manufacture.

I think I do not err in saying that such a course would be at once broad and thorough; that it would commend itself to many a parent who hesitates between the impracticability of the ordinary college course and the narrowness of the business college; that it would be of inestimable benefit in training up young men to be not merely successful merchants, but intelligent citizens, public servants, and legislators, and that it would tend to elevate the standard of the whole commercial community.

JAMES HODGES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR HAND IN MAXIMILIAN'S FATE.

In a paper upon General Grant written by General Badeau and printed in the Boston *Herald*, October 24th, 1886, a degree of responsibility is laid upon General Grant for the execution of Maximilian. The statement attracted my attention from its improbability. There can be no doubt that General Grant was deeply, sincerely, and even bitterly opposed to the establishment of a monarchy in Mexico, but he looked upon Napoleon as the person who was responsible, and solely responsible, for the undertaking. Moreover, General Grant was not only a humane man, but he was indisposed to inflict the penalty of death upon a fallen foe who had been overthrown in a political contest. His policy in regard to the leaders of the rebellion should be accepted as conclusive evidence upon that point.

Next, General Badeau asserts that General Grant gave "indirect advice" to the Mexican Minister in favor of the execution of Maximilian.

This course of action, so attributed to General Grant, is contrary to all that is known of him, whether in private life or in public affairs. He was free from duplicity, and he never shrunk from the responsibility of his opinions, advice, and deeds.

Such being my impressions of the character of General Grant, and having the right through many years of acquaintance and intimacy to count myself among his friends, I wrote a letter to His Excellency M. Romero, of which the following is a copy:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 1429 New York Avenue,
"*December* 20, 1886.

"SIR: I inclose herewith a strip from the Boston *Herald* of the 24th day of October last, which contains an article written by General Adam Badeau, entitled 'Grant in Peace.'

"I beg leave to call your attention to the paragraph marked, which commences thus:

"'In 1867 the French were finally withdrawn, and Maximilian was left to his fate.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The concluding part of the paragraph reads thus:

"'Maximilian was tried like any other individual who sought to subdue the institutions of the State; he was found guilty and shot—a lesson that usurpers will long remember. Grant concurred in the abstract justice of the act. Attempts were made to induce him to recommend clemency, for his influence would have been very great with the Mexicans, who knew how ardently he had supported their cause; but he sternly refused to interfere. Indeed, his indirect advice to the Mexican minister at Washington, doubtless communicated to his Government, was in favor of meting the same punishment to a crowned offender as to humbler culprits.'

"As you were the minister referred to, may I ask you whether the above statement is accurate as to General Grant's course in regard to the execution of Maximilian? With great respect,

(Signed) "GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

"To His Excellency M. ROMERO,

"Minister Plenipotentiary, etc., etc., Washington, D. C.

"You will please return the slip."

This letter gave rise to the correspondence which follows:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *December* 22, 1886.

"MR. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL, 1429 New York Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, inclosing a slip from the Boston *Herald* of the 24th of October last (which I return to you herewith, in compliance with your request), containing an article written by General Adam Badeau, entitled 'Grant in Peace,' wherein, on speaking of Maximilian's execution in Mexico, June 19th, 1867, after the withdrawal of the French army, you ask me if the statements contained in said article, in regard to General Grant's course in that execution, are correct. It is assumed in that article that attempts were made to obtain General Grant's influence in favor of clemency in Maximilian's case, and that the General not only refused to interfere, but that he advised the Mexican minister at Washington, which position was then filled by me, that he was in favor of meting the same punishment to a crowned offender as to humble culprits.

"Several years having elapsed since those events occurred, I have no exact recollection of them to enable me to bear out or contradict General Badeau's statements. I can assure you, however, that if General Grant had expressed any decided opinion on this point, I would have communicated it to my Government, to whom I exerted myself in keeping posted of everything that occurred here at that time, and no record whatever of this fact, previous to Maximilian's execution, appears in the correspondence of the Mexican Legation, at Washington, from 1861 to 1867, which I have published complete in Mexico, as it contains data which, in my opinion, are indispensable for writing the history of that epoch.

"The Mexican newspapers have recently published a letter I addressed to General Grant from this city, May 31st, 1867, in reply to one which the General wrote to me when he heard here that Queretaro had fallen, May 15th. It appears from said letter that he gave me this advice as to the way in which the vanquished ought to be dealt with.

"I have not in Washington the papers relating to the foreign intervention in Mexico, which I keep at my home in Mexico City, and I am therefore unable to rectify the contents of (the) General Grant's letter; but by the terms of my reply to him I infer that his advice or recommendation was rather in favor of the pardon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Maximilian. I do not inclose you copy of my letter to General Grant, because I have not here its text, and the publication made of it in Mexico is an inaccurate translation from English into Spanish, and if I should try now to translate it again from Spanish into English, it would differ very much from the original.

"I am very respectfully yours, M. ROMERO."

Mr. Boutwell to M. Romero:

"WASHINGTON, *January* 6, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 22d of December was received at my office during my absence from the city.

"It might lead to the solution of the question presented in my note of the 20th of December, if correct copies of the letter, that passed between you and General Grant, and referred to in the last paragraph of your letter, could be obtained.

"I am anxious, as I think you must be, to have General Grant stand where he chose to place himself. Very truly, GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

"To His Excellency M. Romero,

"Minister, etc., etc."

M. Romero to Mr. Boutwell:

"WASHINGTON, *January* 8, 1887.

"HON. GEO. S. BOUTWELL:

"MY DEAR SIR: It affords me great pleasure to inform you, in answer to your letter of the 6th inst., that soon after I wrote you my previous, of the 22d of December last, I had written to my sister to the City of Mexico, asking her to examine my papers with a view to obtain a correct copy of my letter to General Grant, of May 31st, 1867, on the possible execution of Maximilian, and of the General's letter to which mine was an answer. I think it unnecessary for me to say that I shall do everything in my power to correct any misrepresentations of General Grant's views on that or any other subject.

"Very truly, M. ROMERO."

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 26, 1887.

"HON. GEO. S. BOUTWELL, 1429 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C.:

"MY DEAR SIR: Referring to the letters which I addressed to you on the 22d ultimo and 8th inst., in reply to yours of the 20th of said December and 6th of the present month, wherein I stated that the Mexican newspapers had published a letter purported to have been written by me to General Grant, dated at this city on the 31st of May, 1867, in regard to the probable fate of Maximilian, I beg to say that I have since found that said letter was not addressed to General Grant, but to Mr. Hiram Barney, Ex-Collector of the Port of New York, and that, therefore, General Grant did not express to me in writing any opinion on this subject.

"I am very respectfully your obedient servant,

"M. ROMERO."

Mr. Boutwell to M. Romero:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *February* 2, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 26th of January is before me, but it does not in terms meet General Badeau's statement. He says that General Grant gave 'indirect advice to the Mexican Minister at Washington' . . 'in favor of meting the same punishment to a crowned offender as to humbler culprits,' and that this advice was doubtless communicated to your Government. This implies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the advice was given orally, while your letter of the 26th ult. is limited to advice in writing. Can you say more? Very truly, GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

"To His Excellency M. Romero,

"Minister, etc., etc., Washington."

M. Romero to Mr. Boutwell:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *February* 9, 1887.

"HON. GEO. S. BOUTWELL, 1429 New York Avenue, N. W.

"MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 2d inst., where, in answer to mine of the 26th ultimo, you say that it 'does not in terms meet General Badeau's statement, who says that "General Grant gave indirect advice to the Mexican Minister at Washington. . . . . in favor of meting the same punishment to a crowned offender as to humbler culprits,"' and that this dvice was doubtless communicated to my Government, I beg to say that having found out that my letter, published by a Mexican newspaper, dated at this city, May 31st, 1867, was not addressed to General Grant, but to Hon. Hiram Barney, [I have to repeat now what I said to you in my letter of the 22d of last December, to wit: that several years having elapsed since those events took place, I do not have an accurate recollection of them to enable me to assuredly confirm or contradict General Badeau's statements in regard to General Grant's opinion about Maximilian's execution, but I can assure you that if General Grant had expressed, in his conversations with me, any decided views on this point, I would have communicated them to my Government, and there is no record of this matter in the correspondence of the Mexican legation at Washington, during the French intervention, previous to said execution—which has been lately published in Mexico].

"I am very truly yours,

"M. ROMERO."

Mr. Boutwell to General Badeau:

"WASHINGTON, *February* 11, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR: Since the publication of your article of October 24th, 1886, upon General Grant, I have corresponded with His Excellency M. Romero, in regard to your statement touching General Grant's action in the case of Maximilian. The correspondence warrants the conclusion that your statement is erroneous. I think that a correction should be made, and it may be the better way to publish the correspondence. If you have any suggestion to make I shall be happy to receive it. Very truly,

"GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

"To General Adam Badeau, New York."

General Badeau to Mr. Boutwell:

"28 East 17th Street NEW YORK, *February* 13, 1887.

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR: . . . . . * I am, as you suppose, desirous to be entirely accurate, and would be happy to examine the correspondence between yourself and Mr. Romero, if you will be good enough to send me copies. Thanking you again and in advance,

"I am, dear Governor, very truly yours,

"ADAM BADEAU.

"To Hon. Geo. S. Boutwell, etc."

*The sentences omitted do not relate to the same subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Boutwell to General Badeau :

"WASHINGTON, *February* 18, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 13th instant, in reply to mine, concerning the action of General Grant in the case of Maximilian. It is not practicable for me to send a copy* of my correspondence with M. Romero, but I will annex a copy of a portion, which, in my opinion, relieves General Grant of all responsibility for the execution of Maximilian.

"Very truly yours,

"GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

"To General Adam Badeau,

"28 East 17th street, New York."

General Badeau to Mr. Boutwell :

"28 East 17th Street, NEW YORK, *February* 19, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR: Of course you do not expect me to change my statement on the authority of M. Romero, when that gentleman, in so many words, declines to contradict me ; and I presume that upon examination you have seen reason to modify your opinion, since you do not send me the correspondence which you proposed for publication.

"I can assure you that my papers are very carefully considered, and that I have received the assistance and approval f General Grant's most distinguished military and political friends. I should still be glad to include you in the number.

"Very truly yours, ADAM BADEAU.

"The Honorable Geo. S. Boutwell."

Mr. Boutwell to General Badeau :

"WASHINGTON, *February* 24, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR : This morning I am in receipt of your letter of the 19th inst., with an inclosure marked confidential and dated February 22d. At a convenient time I intend to publish M. Romero's letters.

"If you have proof that General Grant advised the execution of Maximilian, you will not hesitate, I presume, to furnish it to the public. If he so advised the Mexican authorities, his friends cannot complain ; but in the absence of such proof I am unwilling to accept the conclusion that you have reached.

"Very truly, GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

"To Adam Badeau, Esq.

"New York, 28 E. 17th St."

It is not to be assumed from the circumstance that I have initiated this correspondence, that I entertain the opinion that the execution of Maximilian was either unwise or unjust. My object has been to secure for General Grant the place in history which he made for himself when living.

The testimony of M. Romero justifies these conclusions, viz.:

(1.) That General Grant never made any communication to him in writing in regard to the execution of Maximilian.

* The extract is from Mr. Romero's letter, dated February 9, 1887, and the part is included in brackets.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2.) That he has no recollection that General Grant ever gave to him in conversation any advice or suggestion upon the subject.

(3.) That if any advice or suggestion had been made to him by General Grant he should have communicated it to his Government.

(4.) That his correspondence with his Government has been printed, and that no reference is made to the opinions or wishes of General Grant upon the subject. Unless the evidence now submitted can be controlled by proofs not now before the public, the statement made by General Badeau ought not to be accepted either for the purposes of general history or personal biography.

GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THAT EVERLASTING ANDOVER CONTROVERSY."

EVEN while meditating a still further attack upon their peace, one cannot withhold sympathy from those amiable but secular newspapers which feel obliged to report all news, yet have naturally a prejudice in favor of the news of this world. Protection, *earthquakes, the Eastern question, Home Rule, are known factors* in the problem; but what satisfaction can there be in discussing the shadowy intangible politics of the unseen universe? Thus, not understanding its terms, yet with contempt a little held in check by the knowledge that the dispute has something to do with religion, and must, therefore, not be too savagely condemned or too lightly dismissed, the genial but perplexed editor gives his daily ecclesiastical items as needs must, but in one breath excuses his ignorance, and relieves while veiling his impatience, with no harsher a characterization than "that everlasting Andover controversy."

All for love and nothing for rebuke, I timidly approach these representative men of affairs, and—if for a moment the vigilance of this REVIEW can be evaded—appropriate a few of its pages for their enlightenment. I wish to show them—not necessarily because I am wiser than they, but because I have had more leisure to examine the matter—that it is a question of this world primarily, though of the other world consequently.

The average unprofessional opinion, the opinion, let us say, of the laity of Philadelphia, and Boston, and New York seems to be: old orthodoxy has the technical right; new orthodoxy has the common sense. Old orthodoxy is absurd, but so long as the Andover professors engage to teach it, they ought to teach it or leave. If they no more believe it, they ought to relinquish the funds bequeathed for such teaching and found a new school for the inculcation of their own creed. The laity do not, perhaps,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

go so far as the clergy, intimating against the Andover professors "the most stupendous breach of trust of a century, not unmarked by such crimes." The laity, even at the trial of the professors, rejected this suggestion of their own clients, imputed no breach of trust on the part of the defendants; on the contrary, proclaimed belief in them as eminently honorable, able, upright, conscientious, Christian men, but mistaken in their position.

Judge Hoar, the advocate of old orthodoxy, at the trial of the professors compared the case to that of an English landlady who would not allow a heathen boarder to sacrifice a bull to Jupiter in her back parlor. She did not forbid freedom of thought, but her back parlor was no place for its indulgence in that peculiar form. So, argued Judge Hoar, the back parlor of the Andover Seminary is no place to teach even the doctrines of the Christian religion, if those doctrines are inconsistent with the Andover Creed. I suppose Judge Hoar could hardly find anything more inconsistent with his idea of the doctrines of the Christian religion than his idea of the doctrines of the Andover Creed.

In like manner, the Boston *Advertiser* expresses probably a wide-spread lay opinion when it affirms that there are very many laymen who do not coincide with the complainants' theological opinions who yet agree with them to this extent: that whether the Andover creed itself is theologically sound or not, still the trust by which the Seminary is mainly supported demands strict adherence to the letter of the creed; and for the sake of perfect honesty, therefore, and as an example of the fulfillment of the letter of an obligation, much needed in these days, it would be better that further enjoyments of those old bequests should cease than that the slightest suspicion of their perversion should go forth to the world at large.

This is a phase of the question to which too little attention has been paid, and which is certainly indispensable to a fair and considerate understanding of the conservative side of the controversy.

Professor Phelps, late of the Andover Seminary, yet more strongly maintains the same point. Even if new Andover has the law, he says, honor should restrain them. "Should it be sufficient for honorable men if, in law, the liberty they are assuming cannot be rebuked? Should it even content them that the Supreme Court of Massachusetts would not remove them from their chairs?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He considers it mere hardihood to think that those robust believers and docile readers of the word of God, the founders, would have approved the exotic faith of the Andoverians, if it had been imported in their day, and, therefore, the professors should make it a point of honor not to teach it, although the Creed says nothing about it.

Rev. Dr. Bartol, whose white hairs would be his glory, except, as we learn from the reminiscences of his late happy anniversary, that the bright brow of his earliest manhood was equally radiant with saintly purity—Dr. Bartol cheers on the Andover professors to what he thinks a firmer footing, maintaining that now they are technically wrong. Col. Ingersoll, who has done good service in flushing the sewer-pipes of ecclesiasticism, but who will not be content to dwell in indecency forever, decides, after his præ-Raphaelitic fashion, that the money was given to Andover by a barbarian, and that the question in that Seminary now is: Shall we lose this money, or shall we teach what we know to be lies, out of pure economy, and save what is given us?

Conservative orthodoxy deliberately sums up its decision: "We have little hesitation in declaring our conviction that the complainants are substantially right in their position, and that the Andover professors are not to be justified in their claim that they have a right to teach probation after death under the Creed. The accused seem to us to do violence both to the plain language of the statutes, where it at all approaches the subject of probation, and elsewhere, to the probable intention of the founders."

It thus appears that conservative orthodoxy, liberal Christianity, secular common sense, and ultra radicalism, unite in condemning the Andover professors. Nevertheless, the Andover professors are right, and all the others are wrong. If the Andover professors should give up the contest and withdraw from the Seminary, they would be guilty of a breach of the trust confided to them by the founders. It is not necessarily stupid in outside circles to misunderstand the case, but it is not wise to pronounce upon it until it is understood, and it cannot be understood without attention to the meaning, the use, and the weight of words. We are so accustomed to speak words with a hop, and read them with a skip, and pronounce judgment upon them with a jump, that when important issues are involved we rush wildly astray.

The Andover professors are treating words with accuracy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They understand the case. It is their business to understand it. They are experts. If they should of their own will withdraw, it could not be from misunderstanding. It would be from faint-heartedness. If the Supreme Court should decide against them they might be forced to retire. While that would terminate their connection with the Seminary, it would be no guilt of their own, and no final settlement of the question involved, for this is a battle which is never fought until it is won.

The struggle is really not, as the world maintains, over the acceptance of the Creed, but over the interpretation of the Creed. The present professors accept the Creed. The outside world says they ought not to accept it. Must the professors, the modern experts, the men who have made the Creed the study of their life, must they relinquish it, actually or constructively, because the journal editors, the lawyers, the pastors, and the previous generation of experts think they ought? That is, must a man guide his life by his own conscience and consciousness or by other persons'? The founders of Andover prescribed only that professors should accept and teach the Creed. They did not prescribe how it should be interpreted. The professors swear that they do accept and teach it. Who shall say them nay?

Old orthodoxy charges that they interpret it so differently from the founders that it amounts to a rejection of the Creed.

It would be possible in such a case to fall back on a legal or verbal quibble and be technically right while committing a moral wrong. But there is even no temptation here. On the contrary, the interpretation of the Creed by the professors is wholly in the direction towards which the faces of the founders were turned—that of greater spirituality, increasing reasonableness. What is rejected is the grosser, the more ignorant interpretation. In this they are but treading a little further the same path which the founders trod, and which has been trodden by every intelligent professor since, and by the whole Christian world, so far as it has advanced in spiritual and intellectual life.

A single example will give ample illustration. The Creed declares that the wicked at their death will "with devils be plunged into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone forever and ever."

The founders may well have taken this literally. A little child at play within sound of the Bow Bells of Andover heard some one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that the world was coming to an end in three years. Alone in the attic shortly afterwards she was startled by a chime ringing suddenly through the corridors of memory—"where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." She fancied she must be mistaken. The fire could be borne, but the worm was intolerable. She ran down stairs to the Bible, and was dismayed to find that the worm was there. But it was only for a moment. Happily the swift reflection came, "It will be three years first. By that time I shall be nine years old and pious." The worm, therefore, would be nothing to her, and she resumed her play with tranquillity. So easily the mind innocent of science disposes of unscientific statements.

The founders of Andover were hardly more disturbed by chemistry, geology, biology, ethnology, comparative philology, than was the little girl. They "overset" the Greek into English and left it there. But do the most conservative of orthodoxy to-day believe that brimstone is eternal; that oxygenation can go on forever? Do they believe that spirit can be subjected to the combustion of sulphur? Do they believe that the immaterial soul is wedded to the chemical change of matter? Mr. Samuel Jones lately electrified to shrieks a Boston congregation with a story of a thoroughly materialistic Devil chasing a lost and departing soul around a wood pile and through a window,—which is in line with a part of the Andover Creed; but it is impossible to believe that the Andover complainants would join that hunting. Unless they would, unless they consider it possible to plunge a disembodied soul into actual burning brimstone, unless, that is, they believe that a Calistoga hot spring may be as everlasting as the spirit of man, they have no ground for even a "friendly law suit" with the Andover professors. Judge Hoar, and Dr. Bartol, and Colonel Ingersoll, trained in other schools, may mischievously insist upon the literal rendering or none; but no member of an orthodox Congregational church who dissolves the scriptural brimstone in rhetoric can refuse to the Andover professors liberty to put a rhetorical cast or a literary interpretation upon any other word in the Creed. One old departure from the literal rendering carries all new departures with it. There is no tribunal in the world which has authority to say: thus far shalt thou go, and no farther, in latitude of interpretation.

Applying the principles of the complainants to this illustra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, we find that Colonel Ingersoll would say that barbarians inserted the text in the Creed, that hypocrites teach it for money, and that it is simply a lie. This disposition of the matter has the merit of a simplicity so primitive that one hardly understands why its author should count any other man a barbarian.

The moderate and reasonable layman and the "liberal" clergyman do not believe in the literal brimstone, yet consider that the trust fund by which the Seminary is supported demands literal brimstone, and for the sake of perfect honesty and to set a much-needed good example, they think it would be better to give up the bequest than to let the slightest suspicion of perversion of funds go out to the world on account of the quality of the brimstone.

In phraseology more complicated, this is one with the opinion of Colonel Ingersoll. Neither is more superficial than is to be expected from persons who are able to give only a swift glance to what needs a close inspection. It may be remarked that the principle of the moderate layman is fundamentally wrong. Avoidance of suspicion is not one of the large bases of action. If it were, the rule of a man's life would be changed from the certainty of his own conscience and consciousness to the shifting conjectures of another man's ignorance. It would make the ship sail for the wind and not for port. A ship heeds the wind, but does not follow it. A man heeds suspicion, but is not dominated by it. It may be his primal duty to disregard it. It is never his duty to do one wrong thing in order to avoid the suspicion of doing another.

Professor Phelps rather slips away from the letter of the Creed into undemonstrable generalities, and questions whether it is honorable to teach what is, indeed, outside of the Creed, but what, if it had come up in their day, the founders would have put into the Creed for rejection. This is not quite to the point, but so far as it is to the point, the question is not whether, if the new theology had been taken back a hundred years, the founders would have accepted it, but whether if the founders were brought forward a hundred years they would accept it. To this, one could unhesitatingly answer yes, because they accepted the best light of their day, as their heirs and assigns accept the best light of to-day.

Conservative orthodoxy, under stress of science, weakens a little, and what Col. Ingersoll calls a lie the complainants are willing to call a figure; but beyond that, conservatism refuses to budge. It gives way on one word, but utterly declines to permit any one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to give way on another. It sees that science, chemistry, metaphysics, have made brimstone not only impossible, but ridiculous as a corner-stone of theology; but *forever* is a term of another world, beyond the domain of science, incapable of proof or disproof, and on that word they make a stand.

"The statutes expressly forbid the retention in office of any professor who does not continue to approve himself 'a man of sound and orthodox principles of divinity, *agreeably to the system of evangelical doctrines contained in the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism,*'" says Rev. J. W. Haley. But, questions a puzzled disciple, "Dr. Park said to Dr. Codman that he never believed, and never would believe, the doctrine taught in No. 82 of the Assembly's Catechism. In the opinion of the Visitors, to deny that doctrine was to overturn the gospel. Were not the Visitors blameworthy in allowing Professor Park to subscribe?"

"We have always understood," replies the highest authority, "the Visitors to hold that any deviations from the exact letter of the Creed which did not impair its evangelical character were permissible, and that it was because Professor Park's deviations were such that they were permitted. It is because later ones do not seem to be such, that they are objected to."

It is thus seen that even the Professor Park orthodoxy does not demand strict adherence to the letter of the Creed, but only to such letters of the Creed as itself shall select. The most conservative permit departure from brimstone and No. 82—the things which themselves have been educated out of.

The present Andover professors are only doing a little more of the same work which their predecessors wrought so powerfully in their day. They not only permit the revelation of geology to illuminate the revelation of Sodom and Gomorrah, but they are studying it in the light of heredity and history. When the old orthodoxy explains that fire and brimstone mean that the soul of the incorrigibly wicked will be as exquisitely tortured as would be the body by fire, new orthodoxy sorrowfully admits it, but remembers that the sting of death is sin. The soul enslaved through all its life by sin; the soul that has persistently violated the law, disobeyed the order, destroyed the harmony of the Universe, may, in the revealing light of death, see itself so clearly, see the order of heaven so clearly, as to be devoured with shame and self-contempt—a shame and contempt more biting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and burning than the matter-entangled spirit can conceive. The light from which it could hide behind the flesh, it cannot avoid when the flesh is laid off. Light which is the life of the healthy eye is agony to the diseased eye. But death itself is to be swallowed up in victory. Is it not possible, asks the larger hope,—not seeing the way, seeing only apparent perturbations of the Divine harmony, which seem to mean that there must be a way, because the *Divine* harmony cannot be perturbed,—is it not possible that this spiritual shame shall presently destroy shameworthiness and work out spiritual purification?

But all the ground thus far gone over, though important, is incidental. The essential issue is as yet untouched. It is by no second thought, or strained construction, or late discovery, or even revered precedent, that the Andover professors hold their places. They are in the places appointed them by the founders themselves. They are there by a principle set in the solid base and actual sub-structure of the Creed. That Creed opens with a declaration which not only justifies the professors in holding their places, but which imposes upon them the obligation to hold their places especially against such efforts as are now making to destroy their incumbency, constituting it indeed a betrayal of trust, a dishonor to the founders to withdraw. The Creed embodies a principle which must last as long as time lasts, and can only be dismissed, if even then, by the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds.

By the terms of the Creed "Every professor on this foundation shall publicly make and subscribe a solemn declaration of his faith in Divine Revelation, and in the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel as expressed in the following Creed, which is supported by the infallible Revelation which God constantly makes of Himself in His works of creation, providence, and redemption."

The principle prefacing the Creed is broader and deeper than any item of the Creed, because it underlies them all. It is the rule by which every one of them is to be tested. It is the foundation upon which they must all stand.

First is required—Faith in Divine Revelation.

Second—On this infallible Revelation the Creed stands. By this revelation the Creed is supported. Therefore the Creed is binding just so far as Revelation binds it, and no farther. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason of the Creed is in its harmony with Revelation. If in any point it diverges from Revelation it becomes void, by the will and provision of the founders.

Third—This infallible Revelation is not a completed thing, a fixed quantity. It is a Revelation which God is "constantly" making. Therefore, it is a progressive Revelation. Therefore, the Creed must change to conform to the changing Revelation. There is no meaning to the word *constantly*, unless it means this. Language is incapable of being used in evidence, unless *constantly* is a word of process. To say that God is constantly making a revelation of Himself, and yet that our knowledge of Him must never increase and our belief regarding Him must never change, is only absurdity. The founders imposed the Creed, which, in their view, formulated the revelation that had been made up to their time. But in imposing Revelation as the basis of the Creed, and in stipulating a recognition that God is "constantly" making this revelation, they, by inevitable implication, not only warrant, but impose, constant change in the Creed in order to conform to every fresh revelation.

That there might be no doubt of their meaning they specified the sources whence revelation should be expected.

Works of Creation: This includes every possible discovery of truth by study of the material universe till time shall be no more. Whatever light shall be thrown upon earth or stars from geology, biology, astronomy, chemistry, the founders welcome. Whatever illustrates or elucidates the real mode of creation, the properties of matter, they accept. For all the discoveries and utilities of steam, electricity, the story of the rocks and the suns, the suggestions of the skeleton and the embryo, they made room, only asking that it be a revelation of God; that is, truth. No Darwin, or Huxley, or Tyndall, past, present, or future, can get outside the scope of those Andover founders, whom we in our shallow arrogance have called "iron-bound," but whose principle, inspired of the Holy Spirit, is as flexile as life itself. It may well be that they did not know the full scope of their words, but that is ever the Divine reward of them who speak and do the best they know.

Revelation in Providence: This includes the whole history of humanity,—language, race, growth, migration, the rise and fall of nations, and of men, from the first rude trace of primeval man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the earth to the last item in the morning newspaper. The present is photographing itself to the student with a minuteness never excelled. Into the past, the scientist, the antiquarian, the Egyptologist, are searching with an enthusiasm constantly increasing under success, and a success ever conquering fresh advantages. But whatever revelation God has made or may make of Himself in His relations to men—through flint-knife, or exhumed statue, or uncovered tile, or deciphered record, or discovered manuscript, or long-buried city, the founders of Andover Seminary made provision for it all in the opening sentence, the ground plan of their Creed.

Revelation of Redemption brings us to the culmination of all Revelation—in Jesus Christ our Lord—the Holy Spirit of prophecy; the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The written word remains. No addition can be made to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Therefore, the revelation which God is constantly making of Himself in Redemption must be through new light thrown on the Bible, new light shining upon its interpretation from the new revelation of Himself through His works of creation and providence, through science and history. For this also the founders made room in that profound and wonderful opening sentence of their "iron-bound" Creed—a sentence which binds them, not with iron, but with the elasticity and strength of the interstellar ether to every sphere of truth that shall swing out into the light of new knowledge henceforth forevermore.

For the Andover professors to give up their Seminary to the old orthodoxy would be to give up the inspiration of the fathers to the limitations of the sons; would be to relinquish light to darkness, breadth to narrowness, growth to death, Heaven's flash of radiance to earth's brooding obscurity. It would be to snatch from the founders the glory of their crown, to hide its splendor beneath the *débris* of our own mechanisms. Repression may succeed, but it will be temporarily. If this age cannot discern the solemn and stately procession of thought, the next age will. It is better to fail in a good cause than to succeed in a bad one. But failure is not to be thought of. It seems to me that I see already, beautiful upon the mountains, the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings. Surely the air is alive and astir with the breath of a new spring.

GAIL HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEECHER'S PERSONALITY.

In the nature of things, men of genius are incomprehensible by the ordinary mind in exactly the direction and measure in which their gifts and powers excel those possessed in common by the rest of mankind. Nor can genius of one description appreciate or comprehend its exhibition in others unless it be of kindred nature. To Carlyle, Liszt was a fool. An Edison cannot view an Emerson with clearer ken than an ordinary man. Grant might know Napoleon, but neither of them could grasp a Shakespeare.

To Henry Ward Beecher common consent unhesitatingly ascribes the possession of genius. Nor was that genius of any narrow or restricted variety. It was both moral and intellectual. In the latter sphere also it presented many forms and phases. It was oratorical, linguistic, poetic, humanitarian. He sounded all the depths of emotion, all the heights of inspiration. As an analyst of character he was as great as was Shakespeare as a synthesist. As a student and reader of nature he could have rivaled an Agassiz or an Audubon. In wit and humor he was the peer of the most celebrated. In short, history records no man who outranked his fellows in more directions, and to a greater extent, and who fell below the average in fewer elements and developments of mind and soul. Hence, it is evident that no single biographer can justly estimate the character nor more than partially portray his life. As, from various standpoints, from different sides, under everchanging conditions of sky and air, and with widely diverse powers of observation and capacities of feeling in those who gaze upon its awful form, Mont Blanc presents to each beholder a form perceived by no other, so do men of great and varied genius stand related to their fellows. One glimpse of the mighty mountain may suffice to awe and entrance the stranger. But one must live under its shadows, in every vale that sleeps at its feet; must study it in storm and sunshine, at each hour of the day and year; must tread its snows and glaciers; must scale its rocky sides, and stand upon its summit, and, even then, can know

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mont Blanc only according to his own capacity. And so, in the estimate of such a man, numberless friends and acquaintances, each from his own standpoint, and with his own receptivity, may have studied Mr. Beecher, may have comprehended him as they could, and may formulate their ideas of such a multiform genius, but not one, even of his intimates, can rightly and fully depict him. But from all such sources combined the world must derive its estimate of him, and, in time, will come to know, and understand, and appreciate his nature and character as fully and justly as he can be known.

Entertaining such convictions, I have ventured, in a very imperfect and fragmentary manner, to describe Mr. Beecher as I have seen and felt his influence during the past score of years. And, though my appreciation of this great nature be but narrow, yet as, in some particulars at least it is one of which no other person is capable, I venture to record my impressions. Of their positive or relative value others must judge.

I shall attempt to speak only of his physical and intellectual nature. To others, far better qualified, must be left a consideration of his moral genius.

Had the world to-day a record of the mere physical appearance of Shakespeare, it would doubtless prove exceedingly interesting. And though, through the press and the photograph as well as the recent presence of the subject of this sketch in many parts of his own country, and in England, his physical peculiarities are well known, it may not be superfluous to note them here. Aside from his face, Mr. Beecher would not have attracted marked attention in a crowd. His figure was short and compact. Although but five feet eight inches in height, his weight for several years had averaged about two hundred and twenty-five pounds. But his flesh was so well distributed that he did not appear clumsy nor obese. His carriage was erect and noble. His complexion was florid, and his smoothly-shaven face and white locks contrasted finely with it. His hair was somewhat thin, but to the last it fully covered his head. It was allowed to grow to the collar, and was swept behind the ears. His head was not extraordinary in size,* measuring only twenty-three inches in circum-

* He wore what is called a 7¼ hat, and prominent dealers inform me that the number most frequently sold is 7⅛. Each one-eighth represents one-half inch of circumference.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference, but his massive face and features gave it an appearance of greater bulk. His forehead was rather retreating than bold, except that the brow was full. His eyes were prominent and seemed large. They were grayish blue in color, and so perfect were these organs as to require no artificial aid, even for protracted work. The upper lids were full and overhanging—a formation which has been noted as characteristic of many distinguished orators and actors. His nose bore a fair proportion to the rest of his features, and presented no marked peculiarity of form. His mouth was large, and the lips neither full nor thin. They closed firmly. The cheeks were full, quite remarkably so beneath the ears, which latter organs were well formed, and set far back upon the head. The chin was somewhat square, and gave a determined look to his face. His expression was exceedingly varied. Never was there a more mobile countenance, nor one that more quickly and decisively responded to every emotion.

Numerous photographs of him exist, but no two afford the same expression. His neck was large and short. The chest was full and capable of great expansion. His digestion was uniformly good, and afforded him a plentiful supply of generous blood, without which the functions performed by his brain would have been largely inhibited. The blood vessels of his entire frame were extraordinarily capacious for a man of his temperament. This latter might be classed as a mixture of the lymphatic and sanguine, with a dash of the nervous. The arteries and veins of his scalp were nearly double in size of those of an ordinary man, and if one might judge from the coldness of his extremities during mental labor (a constant and often distressing phenomenon) it would seem probable that those of his brain were correspondingly large. In his habits he was very regular and temperate. He early ascertained what was hurtful and what beneficial to him, and he carefully conformed to the latter. This he did, not from selfish concern for his comfort only, but, as is well known by his intimates, because he would not sacrifice on the altar of appetite what belonged to his duties as a minister of Christ. No man "brought his body under," to use the words of St. Paul, more rigorously and vigilantly than he.

He was immoderate only in sleep. This he must, and would, and did obtain in generous proportion. In the full tide of work an afternoon siesta was always insisted upon, and he could com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose himself to peaceful slumber even amidst much confusion. He was not "valiant at the trencher," but ate well and carefully. To coffee he was devoted, and it served him well as a stimulus and paratriptic—never rendering him nervous. Of mild ales and wines he partook sparingly, and only when he deemed them essential for his health. Like most great actors and singers, he ate very lightly before speaking—a cup of coffee or tea, with a scrap of toast only. Afterwards, he was ready for substantial food.

Few men of sedentary occupation suffered less from functional disorders, but he took far more exercise and relaxation than the majority of his class. His tastes were so various, and so freely indulged, that they compelled bodily exercise for their gratification. Saturday was his holiday, and he knew how to take one, and get as much out of it as any school-boy. When at home, it was spent in the picture galleries, museums, concerts, spectacles, or shops of the great city. There can be no doubt that such a happy temperament, such varied tastes, and such habits as resulted from them, very largely contributed to keep his health of both body and mind in their usual perfect condition.

From his farm in Peekskill, where he buried much money, he reaped a precious harvest, not only of health, but rich stores of mental and moral pabulum. Never was there a better or more largely paying investment, and well would it be for our clergy and their congregations did they emulate his example. Trips to Europe and the mountains are well enough, but close contact with the life-giving bosom of old mother nature in her fields and gardens is the "more excellent way." In early years he suffered much from frequent attacks of quinsy, but during the past decade they were easily arrested. Bilious attacks were not uncommon, but he made short work of these by sleep and starvation. To hay-fever, however, he was annually obliged to succumb, unless he resorted to the White Mountains or to distant journeys. With these exceptions he enjoyed remarkable health. The tastes to which reference has been made were various and innocent, but were, for the time, many of them, veritable passions. All his life long he was a thorough and intelligent bibliophile, and he accumulated books until his residences would hold no more. His library contains many rare and beautiful works, and numbers about 15,000 volumes. Of gems, too, he was passionately fond. He was accustomed to say that they afforded him the same kind of pleasure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he derived from flowers, and that they excelled the latter in that they were fadeless. Their purity and color had a never satiating charm for him. Thousands of dollars he lavished upon them. His yellow diamond, of the purest canary color, has a European pedigree and history.

Not a stone with which St. John has embellished the walls of the Holy City was missing from his collection. It is doubtful if he was ever without unset gems in his pockets, which he would often exhibit for his own delectation or that of his friends. He haunted the shops of jewelers, and often borrowed from them gems of great value, in which he fairly reveled with delight. He took the greatest pleasure in those of richest and most gorgeous hues, the ruby, the opal, the carbuncle, the emerald, etc. Indeed, color, its shades and combinations, whether in nature or art, appeared to engage his fancy rather than form, although to perfection in this regard he was ever acutely sensitive. Hence his love for painting, rather than for sculpture. Never shall I forget the delight he took in the Russian wedding feast lately exhibited in New York, nor how earnestly he enjoined it upon me to visit it. Of all paintings, at home or abroad, he best loved the Sistine Madonna, and even his eloquent tongue failed to express the emotions he experienced when he stood before it. In engraving and etching he was a connoisseur, and many rare examples of this class of work were in his possession. He accumulated these, and paintings also, until the walls of his home failed to accommodate them. At one time he made a collection of stuffed humming-birds and birds of paradise, which was beautiful beyond description. Exquisite also, as well as extensive, was his accumulation of *bric-à-brac* and of *faience:* within my knowledge only the Morgan collection surpasses it. Even that, though far more costly, does not equal it in tasteful selection. Although no musician, harmony and melody enraptured him. Often he sought in them rest, elevation, and inspiration, and found them all. When consistent with his duties, he was a devoted and discriminating listener in concert and opera. For the combinations and varieties of color exhibited in the productions of the loom he had a fancy which was freely indulged. No lady of taste could derive more satisfaction from a shopping expedition than he. From his recent visit to England he returned laden with spoils of this description for his relatives and friends—silks and plushes and velvets fit for a queen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But more than all these, his soul reveled in nature and her productions. Each spring was a regeneration to him, and he watched for her coming as the sick long for the morning. By no means insensible to the joys and beauties of winter, it was the birth and growth and fruition of the seasons that brought him ever fresh delight in their course. Regarding trees, it is enough to say that upon his thirty-six acres in Peekskill there stand to-day more than six thousand varieties of purely ornamental trees, interspersed with fruit of every variety that can be forced or coaxed to grow in this climate. Rare shrubs and flowers of every kind and hue and shape and fragrance diversify the landscape and load the air with perfume. Horses, cattle, bees, and fowls of choicest breed were equally sought.

And superadded to all these tastes was a comprehensive and exact knowledge of all the objects that ministered to them. Whether they were books or gems, works of art or productions of nature, he studied and learned and knew their origin and habits, their habitat and training, the processes involved in their production, whence and when and how and why, so far as books or experts in each department could inform him. And from each and all he drew much of the inspiration, as well as illustration, that glowed in lecture and sermon—in prayer and praise. He lived close to the great throbbing heart of nature, and she whispered her secrets in his ear. He haunted, the factory, foundry, furnace, and machine shop, and studied their processes. No engineer, mechanic, or artisan but his thirsty soul pumped dry at every opportunity. His was a child-like nature in many ways, and, like a boy, he was ever eagerly inquisitive and insatiable. But with the indomitable persistency of a man he hunted the world for the achievements of art and science, and the facts and phenomena of nature. Nay, he hesitated not to plunge into and investigate the so-called supernatural. And mixed by the alchemy of that wondrous brain, interwoven with fancy, and wit, and philosophy, and theology, he poured them forth in floods of emotion and illustration and poetic imagery. As the dull iron enters the magnetic fluid, and emerges lustrous with pure gold, so the soberest fact, gilded by his imagination, became radiant, beautiful, enchanting. I have spoken of Mr. Beecher's wonderful memory for facts of the foregoing description ; equally wonderful was it in regard to persons and their history. But this faculty is common amongst

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great men. Singular to relate, however, his memory, in some respects, was phenomenally deficient. Phrases, sentences, isolated terms, dates, items, were absolutely forgotten as soon as heard. The only thing of this sort that he could recall was the list of Latin prepositions that govern the ablative case. This he could repeat with all the linguistic facility of the Major General in the opera. Not a couplet of any hymn, though sung in his ears and by his tongue for a lifetime, not a passage of Scripture, not a scrap from the most celebrated authors or orators, could he quote with even a probability of accuracy.

Doubtless this was at least one of the reasons for his most wonderful versatility of expression. One may read his sermons and prayers, and though his ideas may be and are repeated, they are always clothed afresh ; no set phrases, no quotations are to be found. The titles of his lectures remained the same, but their substance and language underwent constant change. The currency of his mind was always golden, but it was fresh from the mint and stamped with a new device at every issue. How largely this was attributable to the forgetfulness referred to, and how much to his marvelous gift of language, may be a question, but concerning the facts there can be no discussion.

Upon the peculiar methods of his mind, and upon the sensitiveness of his organism, as well as upon his strong common-sense, the following interview sheds considerable light, and it will be regarded by many with no little interest. I called upon him professionally, at his request, on June 14th, 1873, and he made to me the following statement :

"My general health is better than usual at this time of the year. I think I have come out of my labors, and through the unusual mental strain and excitement of the past winter, with more than my usual vigor. The subject upon which I wished to consult you is in respect to my mental state.

"Emotion with me works inward, not outward, often till it seems as if there were a vast gulf formed by it within me. My intellectual efforts are intuitional, to a large extent. A sermon seems spread out before me like a picture, into which my brain seems to open out, and inspired by which I preach. All this is customary and normal, but latterly, as a result, I think, of mental strain, there has come upon me a peculiar experience which I clearly recognize as illusional, but which, nevertheless, is very real to me. I retire at night, and sleep well until about 4 A. M., when I am startled from a sleep which has been dreamless by hearing my name called ; and I lie awake, hearing, distinctly and with apparent reality, voices calling me in the sweetest and most inviting tones. Nothing of terror is experienced ; on the contrary, my moral state is the most blissful and entrancing. I seem to be on the very borders of Heaven. Now, while this is the case, my judicial reasoning self lies there perfectly aware that this is all hallucination, and the outworking of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an overwrought and overstrained brain. I seem to have a double existence, as if another self were beside me in the bed—one perfectly sane and recognizing the other as abnormal, and the other under the full sway of these illusionary perceptions—as well satisfied with their reality as if they truly existed. Now, I have yet four weeks of labor before I can go to grass for the summer's rest, and I want to be sustained so far as may be during them.

"Something of the sort has come to me when in a fever. Then my being has seemed to become a noun of multitude, my feet seemed a tenement-house full of insubordinate tenants whom I endeavored to control in vain. Each separate part of me was an individual, and all in discord. But the most curious imagination has been that I was a locomotive, all fired up, and impatiently waiting for the engineer who would come to start me."

To some it may be interesting to add that this hallucination was quickly dispelled by the administration of Cannabis Indica, or Haschish, as it is called in the East. To all, it is an autobiographical exposé of the workings of this marvelous intellect, and the sensitiveness of this harplike organism, while it also demonstrates the sound substratum of common-sense which recognized at once the cause of his condition, and sought in medicine for its cure.

As a wit, Mr. Beecher shone most brightly in repartee, and in this faculty lay one of the great secrets of his fame as an orator. Without this he would have been less sure of success, to say the least, when he "fought with the beasts" in Liverpool, and London, and Richmond, and wherever else he had to confront an audience of enemies. Let him once turn the laugh upon an interlocutor, as he never failed to do, and his cause was won. His blows of this discription were always fair and honorable, and he took a fair return with the utmost good humor. No man ever angered him in debate. And this characteristic, with his indomitable courage, brought even the most stubborn and malignant opponent to his feet not only, but made from his fiercest enemy often a warm and lifelong friend. His humor was so spontaneous and irrepressible, so honest and wholesome, it bubbled out of him so readily, and (as it sometimes appeared to pious souls) so *malà-propos*, that, though it not seldom affronted such ill-trained spirits, it formed one of the most effective and often the most trenchant weapon in his armory. In private life this feature of his mind rendered him a most brilliant conversationalist, and brightened the life of all around him. When he could lay aside all restraint in the company of his intimates he often appeared as full of fun and mischief as the most rollicking boy. Hundreds of his letters exist of which the following is a fair example:

"MY DEAR DOCTOR: The world, in turning over, a few weeks ago rolled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on my right leg, and it has been somewhat sore ever since. To-day it is not swelled, but it refuses to take its ease when walking, and sulks and behaves unseemly. My wife laughs at me and says it is rheumatism—which is absurd—as I have not been in any way exposed to it. Gout, it is not, I know. I don't want to preach to-morrow on one leg. Can you suggest any mode of bringing the ailing member to good behavior. Yours hobblingly,

"HENRY WARD BEECHER."

But upon this side of his character I need not dwell. It was too obvious and universal to need further consideration here.

But who would dream that in such a bright, courageous nature, that in an orator who had proven his power so often, and under such conditions, there should lurk a vein of shyness, self-depreciation, and self-disparagement. And yet it was there. He has told the writer that when he first came to Brooklyn, and people began to praise and make much of him, he could not be persuaded that their estimate was not too flattering; and so strong was this feeling in him that he often took by and unfrequented streets to avoid meeting with acquaintances. He also informed me that when he appeared in public where other speakers preceded him, he often felt, while they were addressing the audience, such an admiration for their powers, and so certain that he could not compete with them that, had it been possible, he would have abandoned the attempt. But once upon his feet, hesitation and doubt vanished. As he himself told me, he went to confront his Liverpool audience with trembling and prayers and even tears. But once before them, said he, "I felt as if the whole Atlantic Ocean were under my feet, and I knew I could conquer them." His courage there and elsewhere, under like circumstances, was grand and sublime.

Discussion has often been rife as to which of his great speeches was the most effective. The whole series of addresses in England, in 1863, his lecture in Richmond, his address in the Academy of Music in Brooklyn on the occasion of the reception of Parnell, as well as others, were magnificent exhibitions of oratory. But in my opinion (one in which I am sustained by high authority and the ripe judgment of many) the most sublime efforts of his life were those which were made upon the spur of the moment before the Advisory Council on February 18th, 1876. They are to be found recorded on pp. 240, 255 *et seq.* of the printed proceedings of that body.

My reasons for these opinions are as follows: It is a simple matter for an orator to sway an audience in general sympathy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with him. Next to this, for Mr. Beecher, it was easy to subjugate and control a gathering of his enemies. But to rise without premeditation before a deliberative body, composed, for the most part, of critical theologians, of judges who upon the bench had long ago exhausted all that life has to give of emotion, and were habituated to regard only the dictates of dispassionate reason, of men who, though not avowed enemies, were, many of them, under the influence of suspicions directed against his moral character—to rise as he did, upon the instant, and, within a few moments, hold every mind and soul within his easy grasp, to sweep the whole gamut of feeling, and sway them as the wind plays with a field of wheat—ah! that was sublime and God-like power.

And, just here, it may be worth while to remark that he always spoke *ex tempore*, and, as it might appear to some, with inadequate preparation. It was his custom always to write out the heads of his morning discourse after breakfast on Sunday morning. And an equally brief preparation was made for his evening sermon. Nor were his lectures more elaborated. He was a truly inspirational speaker, and his moods of mind and body, the state of the weather, and all exterior circumstances were reflected in his addresses as clouds are mirrored in the lake.

Mr. Beecher's nature was frank, generous, and trustful to a fault. He was incautious even to heedlessness. He could not understand nor be made to believe that he could have an enemy who would lie in wait to trip him, and glory in deceit. To men of the world, of prudence and caution, he appeared reckless in the extreme. Many have wondered at the friends he at times confided in. In this respect let him speak for himself.

"I am the child of a noble mother and of a noble father, and I was brought up in an austere morality, in a pure and unblemished household, with a most reverent honor for truth, for duty, for love. And to me has been given a nature for which, whether it be prudent or whether it be not, I am not questionable. When they rebuke the vine for throwing out tendrils and holding on to anything that is next to it, whether it be homely or handsome—whether it be dry or full of sap—then they may rebuke me. When you shall find a heart to rebuke the twining morning glory, you may rebuke me for misplaced confidence; you may rebuke me for loving where I should not love. It is not my choice; it is my necessity; and I have loved on the right and on the left, here and there, and it is my joy that to-day I am not ashamed of it. I am glad of it, and if I had my life to live over again, and were to choose between cold caution, calculating every step, without trust and confidence in man, I would, with all its liabilities, choose to be generous, to be magnanimous, to be trustful, and to lean, though some one should step aside and let me fall to the ground."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Noble soul! here was the charity that "thinketh no evil!"

Nor, though once ensnared by devils who plotted his ruin, did he ever lose his faith in man, nor bate one jot of his openness, his frankness, his generous confidence and trust in his companions and friends, and to-day a world weeps at his funeral.

It would be possible to enumerate and illustrate many other distinctive peculiarities of this wonderful man: his wide benevolence, his forgetfulness, utter and absolute, of injuries which would, in most, have incurred a life-long resentment. His most malevolent enemy had but to show a sign of relenting, and his great heart was ready and eager, not only to throw the mantle of forgiveness and forgetfulness over the past, but to take him into fresh and hearty confidence and affection. Said one of his parishioners to me, "I had not spoken to a man for years because he had so grievously insulted Mr. Beecher, when, to my unbounded surprise, I one day met them coming down the street arm in arm."

Of his heroic endurance and silent uncomplaining suffering under agonies which a soul less sensitive than his cannot begin to conceive, others can speak more eloquently than I.

Whether it be true that imagination is the basis of faith, and that capacity for the latter depends upon the development of the former in the individual, one thing is certain: no more brilliant and vivid imagination was ever bestowed upon man, and no one ever possessed stronger or greater certitude of faith. It was implicit and all pervading; it was at once his glory and his joy; it bore him above all forms of trial and suffering; it gave him sublime courage in danger; it enabled him to welcome death with smiles.

Well has it been said that to know this man was not only to admire and enjoy him, but to love him with an affection that in every true and honest heart grew deeper and fonder with every hour, every day, every year.

W. S. SEARLE, M. D.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIGH LICENSE.

THE proponents of a new general statute should be able to prove one of two alternatives, viz., either that the existing law when it is enforced is inadequate, or that it cannot be enforced. The principal objections to our excise laws fall under the latter head. They are in many respects a dead-letter. If they could be fully executed, if saloon-keepers observed the Sunday regulations and refrained from selling to minors, and especially to intoxicated men and habitual drunkards, there would be no popular demand for legislative action on the subject. It is undeniable that saloon-keepers as a class are law-breakers, and that they have only themselves to thank for the great temperance movement, which, blind and misguided as it often is, continues to grow in strength from day to day, and promises to become irresistible as soon as it can separate itself from fanaticism. Retail liquor-dealers should, for their own benefit, aid in the enforcement of the laws and prevent their trade from being a nuisance and danger to the public, but they are too short-sighted to perceive what their true interests are. The result is that the excise laws are disregarded. Many sporadic attempts have been made to put them into successful operation, but they have had no lasting effect.

There are two reasons for this failure. In the first place, the dram-shops are so numerous that it is impossible to keep them under supervision. No excise board or police force can watch them as they should be watched. No prosecuting attorney or criminal court can dispose of the cases, if the police are able to do their part of the task. In the second place, the political power of the saloons is so great that our public officials are afraid to do their duty. This political power is cultivated by the liquor men for the express purpose of enabling them to violate the law, and the social character of their business makes it easy for them to influence voters. Their wide-spread control of public affairs is,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of course, altogether dependent on their numbers. If they were few, their power at the polls would be small.

It is evident, therefore, that the only way to secure the enforcement of any reasonable excise law is to reduce the number of saloons, and thus render it possible to supervise them all and at the same time reduce their political power and leave public officers free from dictation. Various ways have been suggested. The law may itself fix the number of saloons in proportion to the population. It may provide for the sale at auction of the privilege to keep a liquor shop. It may raise the license fees and adopt the now popular system of high license in place of our present low licenses. The first plan of fixing the number of saloons by law lacks one important feature of the high-license scheme. It reduces the public revenue from the trade instead of increasing it. The two plans can, however, be conveniently combined. The idea of auction sales has never, probably, been tested. It would introduce a constant element of uncertainty into the business which would hardly be fair to the dealer. He would be forced at stated intervals to defend his franchise at public sale, and might lose it to the first speculator who overestimated its value.

The words "high license" have no very definite meaning. They include annual license fees for all kinds of liquors, varying from five hundred to a thousand dollars or more, and fees for wine and beer of a hundred dollars and upward. It would be better, perhaps, to speak of "higher license" than "high license." The introduction of such fees has the advantage of establishing no radical change in the present custom. It is merely an alteration in figures, but in actual operation it produces substantial results. It reduces the number of saloons most effectually, and lays a foundation for all the advantages which, as we have seen, are based on such a reduction. Many liquor men who pay the low license without difficulty find that they cannot afford to pay a high license, and are forced to adopt some more honorable occupation. Those who pay the high license appreciate the value of a right which has cost them so much, and see to it that no unlicensed dealer infringes upon their privileges. The licensed men guard each his own neighborhood.

Furthermore, they can form associations for mutual protection and employ detectives to ferret out the unlicensed places. Under low license there is no incentive to such a course. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difference between paying fifty or seventy-five dollars a year and paying nothing is so little that it is not worth while to make trouble about it. Any dealer can pay the fee in case of necessity, but a thousand dollars is beyond the means of many of them. That a high-license statute can be perfectly enforced is, to be sure, not true, but neither can any other law. Where public opinion supports legislation it can be made approximately effective. Popular sentiment is to-day in favor of high license, and there is little doubt but that the people who insist on the passage of such laws will insist on their enforcement. As the number of saloons grows less, their political power decreases, and it becomes easier to make the police and courts do their duty. The licensed dealers have so much at stake that they hesitate to break the law for fear of forfeiting their valuable licenses. A high-license act can include provisions for the prevention of evasions of the law. The concealment of liquor in an unlicensed shop can be made a misdemeanor of itself, and the possession of a United States revenue certificate may be constituted evidence of sale.

It is usual to make a distinction in licensing between wine and beer on the one hand and spirits on the other. Such a discrimination in a high license act is both just and salutary. It is good policy to encourage the consumption of mild beverages at the expense of rum and whisky. A man who goes into a saloon to drink gin and finds nothing stronger than ale may change his mind and content himself with what he can get there. In this way it is wise to make it easier to buy a glass of wine than one of brandy. There is another good reason for establishing a graded scale of licenses in a high license bill. It enables present dealers to continue in the business until they can find another occupation, and does not suddenly take away their means of livelihood. A beer license at a hundred dollars can easily be secured by almost any one already established in the liquor trade, and he is only forced to give up selling stronger kinds of drink.

If such a business may not pay sufficiently well in the long run, it can at least afford an opportunity of looking for something better. The charge is frequently made that it is impossible to prevent a man who has a beer license from selling all sorts of liquor. The law would undoubtedly be broken in this way, but not to any great extent. The regular dealers would protect themselves against such illegal competition, as we have seen that they would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when their rights are threatened by men who hold no license whatever. It is a wise precaution to make the keeping on the premises of any kind of liquor not covered by the license a criminal offense.

It is noticeable that high license cuts off the worst class of saloons. With few exceptions, the cheapest, poorest places are the greatest nurseries of crime, and these cannot afford to pay a large fee. Again, this system does much to prevent the establishment in the business of men who have no capital. It is customary now for rich brewers to advance the money needed for opening a drinking place, taking back a chattel mortgage on the fixtures as security. In this way they multiply the number of saloons. An increase in the fee makes the expense and risk greater, and consequently discourages such advances. It would be a good plan to make all mortgages on saloon fixtures void. It is often said that high license enriches the dealers, gives them a monopoly, and enables them to make their places more attractive. The answer to this is that the saloons are as attractive now as they can be made, and that it makes no difference to the public whether their proprietors become wealthy monopolists or not, so long as they are forced to keep the law. A high license act may contain provisions to set off the attractiveness of saloons. It may forbid the use of screens at the doors and windows, and even take away chairs and tables, or in any other way remove secrecy and decrease comfort.

One very important advantage of high license is the large revenue which it is sure to bring. This financial policy is not one of profit merely. It does not involve the idea of sharing the returns of an obnoxious traffic. It has its source in the highest poetic justice. That a business which is directly responsible for a large portion of the expenses of the public should be made to assist in bearing the burden is a matter of simple right. If it were possible to compute the exact share in the cost of courts, jails, prisons, hospitals, dispensaries, lunatic asylums, almshouses, orphan asylums, and other public and private institutions for charity and correction, that lies at the door of the saloon, and then to impose a license fee that would cover the outlay, our liquor dealers would be staggered at the result, and accept a tax of a thousand dollars as a merciful condition. The Metropolitan Excise Law, which was passed by the Legislature of New York on April 14th, 1866, affords an excellent example

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of increased revenue produced by increased fees. At this time there were 9,720 saloons in New York and Brooklyn, less than one-fourth of them being in the latter city. In the ten years from 1856 to 1866 less than $170,000 had been collected in license fees in the City of New York. Under the new law, the Metropolitan Board of Health fixed the licenses at $250 and $100. At the expiration of eleven months there were only 6,779 licensed places in the Metropolitan District, of which 5,203 were in New York and 1,476 in Brooklyn. In New York the sum of $993,379 was collected in license fees, and in Brooklyn $257,725. The amount thus obtained in New York exceeded the total sum collected in the preceding twenty years. In 1868 New York received $1,102,271 under this system and Brooklyn $288,436. In thirty-one months New York contributed over $3,000,000. This law was repealed during the supremacy of the Tweed ring.

The system of high license has been sufficiently tested in some parts of the country to prove its value. The Illinois high-license law went into effect in 1883. It closed several hundred saloons in Chicago and about four thousand in the State. The annual revenue from licenses in Chicago was increased from $200,000 to $1,700,000, and in the State from $700,000 to $4,500,000. The *Christian Union*, of January 14th, 1886, contained letters from all parts of the State which show uniformly that the number of saloons had decreased. In Dundee, for example, three of the seven dram-shops were closed. In Kewanee, the number was reduced from ten to six; in La Salle, from sixty to forty; in Mattoon, from thirteen to eight; in Ottawa, from 115 or 120 to about 55; in Peoria, from 226 to 120; and in Rock Island from 84 to 53. In Springfield, 53 of the 157 saloons disappeared. A private letter from the country village of Odell states that the place has become far more orderly. "The saloon-keepers are adjuvants to the authorities. It is their interest to keep out irregular dealers and keep orderly their 'clients.' The village gets $2,250, which maintains a good marshal, and keeps all the side-walks and street crossings in capital condition."

Michigan has tried prohibition and high license. Professor Kent says: "In 1875 we had, under prohibition, 6,444 saloons. Then regulation went into effect. In 1876 our State returns showed 4,867 dealers, or 1,577 of the 6,444 blotted out in one year. In 1877 the returns showed 3,996 dealers, so that 881 more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saloons went out." In 1875 there was "one saloon for every 207 inhabitants. In 1882, six years after the law went into effect, the records of the United States revenue showed the number of saloons was reduced from 6,444 to 3,461, or one saloon to every 536 people, our population being then 1,856,100, a decrease under the tax law of 2,983 saloons, nearly 50 per cent. Now, without this tax law and under the old Prohibition law, we should have been afflicted with 8,966 saloons instead of 3,461. . . . Taxation has spared us all this catalogue of woes, and has put into the county treasuries of the State up to this date a total of $8,166,921."

In Missouri we have the testimony of Governor Marmaduke in his message to the Legislature of January, 1887. He says: "Prior to the enactment and enforcement of the law providing for what is known as 'high license' for dram-shops, there were in this State 3,601 dram-shops and other places where ardent spirits were sold to be used as a beverage, yielding a revenue of $547,320.30. There were on the 4th of July last 2,880 such dram-shops, yielding a revenue of $1,842,208.26. These figures clearly indicate that the law referred to is accomplishing the good result that was anticipated, and, I think, prove the wisdom of it." In St. Louis the receipts from licenses rose from $213,184.45 in the year ending April, 1883, to $739,511.73 in the year ending April, 1886.

The Ohio tax law closed 1,019 saloons in seventy of the eighty-eight counties. Governor Foraker says: "The most reliable data obtainable indicate that the tax law has suppressed a large percentage of the saloons." The *Wine and Spirit Review* gives the following table, showing that a higher license insures fewer saloons:

	Population.	No. of saloons.	Rate of license.	Saloons for 10,000 inhabitants.
Omaha	75,000	176	$1,000	23
Kansas City	125,000	405	845	32
St. Louis	500,000	1,600	550	32
Chicago	800,000	3,760	500	47
Detroit	133,269	1,023	300	76
Indianapolis	100,000	348	200	35
Cleveland	200,000	1,540	200	77
St. Paul	133,000	600	100	45
San Francisco	233,956	2,799	84	114
New York	1,350,000	9,197	75	68
Brooklyn	650,000	3,000	76	46
Baltimore	305,000	2,655	50	73
Philadelphia	847,170	5,959	50	70

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The figures showing population are not altogether accurate, but they are sufficiently so to prove the efficiency of high license.

Some harsh critics of high license measure every actual piece of legislation by a perfect standard. They forget that practical men must take the world as they find it, and be satisfied with what they can get. The law recently passed by the Legislature of New York, and vetoed in the rum interest by the Governor, is a good specimen of legislation based on common sense. The societies that framed the bill—the Church Temperance Society and the Society for the Prevention of Crime—recognized the fact that a perfect measure, including all the latest improvements in excise law, would be open to attack at every point. They also believed that by making the bill cover the whole State enough votes might be lost to endanger its passage, and that there was an especial necessity for a change in the densely populated cities of New York and Brooklyn which did not exist elsewhere. They accordingly drew a bill which presented the naked question of high license for cities of more than three hundred thousand inhabitants. Its main features were a license of one thousand dollars for all kinds of liquor, one of five hundred dollars for wine, beer and cider, and one of one hundred dollars for beer and cider alone. They soon found that it would be necessary to adapt the bill still further to the circumstances. The native wine manufacturers of the State asked that wine should be placed under the one hundred dollar license with beer. The apple growers sought to have cider omitted altogether from the bill, as is the case with the present law. It was thought wise to concede these points. Another request—that the limit of population of cities affected by the bill should be raised from 300,000 to 400,000—was granted, as it made no difference whatever in the application of the law, and would not until Buffalo attained the former figure, nearly doubling its size as shown by the last census. The only other changes in the bill made before its final passage were the increase of the druggist's and storekeeper's licenses to one hundred dollars and the introduction of a provision making it a misdemeanor for a man holding a beer and wine license to keep stronger drink on the licensed premises. These alterations amply proved the good faith of the legislature. That the bill as passed was perfect is, of course, untrue; but, as it was, there were only five votes to spare in the lower house and one in the Senate. The framers of the bill were,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, fully justified in the concessions which they made to expediency. Of course, they were attacked for their common-sense. Honest cranks, who fortunately were without and not within the pale of the societies in question, held up their hands in horror, and the falsifiers of the press in various parts of the State were not slow to take the cue. They pretended that the beer license had been reduced from five hundred to one hundred dollars and that the bill had been *altered* so as to exclude all the cities of the State but New York and Brooklyn. Newspapers that had ardently supported the bill so long as they expected the majority in the legislature to defeat it, changed their front in the most unblushing manner as soon as it had passed both houses. The course of the Church Temperance Society and the Society for the Prevention of Crime, blending reform and policy as they always should be blended, and rising superior to the assaults of fanatics and hypocrites, is a good example for the leaders of the temperance movement throughout the country. Although this bill was vetoed, it should encourage other similar efforts, for it was in some respects successful. It awoke a general sentiment in favor of the reform which will not sleep until it is gratified. It induced the Excise Commissioners of New York City to raise the fees from seventy-five to two hundred dollars, and last, but not least, it insured the speedy downfall of the smallest politician who ever occupied the chair of De Witt Clinton.

The most strenuous opponents of high license are the liquor dealers. We purposely refrain from mentioning the prohibitionists, as, when great cities are in question, they can hardly expect to be taken seriously. The saloon-keepers, however, are entitled to consideration, as their interests are at stake. They make all kinds of inconsistent objections to the proposed law. They say that it will unjustly drive men out of the trade, and, at the same time, that it cannot be enforced. We have already touched upon these points. Every reform treads on some one's toes. A graded high-license act does the least possible damage to private rights. In opposing such a law the liquor men show their inexcusable ignorance of the forces which are marshaling against them. Public opinion is undergoing a wonderful change. To-day it supports prohibition only in some rural districts, but the time may come when it will insist upon it far and wide. Persistent law-breaking, the constant debasing of politics, the never-ending

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manufacture of crime and misery, may drive the public in self-defense to an extreme. History is full of instances of destruction coming upon those classes which refuse to reform themselves. The old aristocracy of France was responsible for its own fate in the Reign of Terror; the slave-holders of the South were themselves the cause of the loss of their slaves without compensation; and if the saloon-keepers of America are forced to pay licenses of five thousand or ten thousand dollars, or are eventually swept away, it will be because they refuse to recognize the spirit of the age and to yield that consideration to public opinion which public opinion sooner or later is sure to obtain. If they know their own interests, let them keep the law, leave politics alone, and accept the demands of the public before they become greater. The argument of the prohibitionists, that high license should be defeated because it postpones prohibition indefinitely, is an admission of the efficacy of the proposed legislation. It simply means that we should encourage crime in order that its destruction may be the more overwhelming. The immorality of such reasoning is too clear to need specification.

In conclusion, we must ask the friends of high license not to claim too much for it. It will not prevent a man of full age, who is neither intoxicated nor an habitual drunkard, from obtaining any kind of liquor whenever he wants it. It will not force your code of morals upon me nor mine upon you. It will not change human nature in the slightest degree. It will merely reduce the number of saloons. This reduction will make it possible to keep the saloons under supervision, and also curtail the political influence of their proprietors over those public officials whose duty it is to enforce the excise laws. The result of this will be that the liquor men will be forced to observe the law with decency. High license will not bring the Millennium, but it will remove us a little further from the Dark Ages.

ERNEST H. CROSBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HEROES TO ORDER.

"I want a hero: an uncommon want
Where every year and month sends forth a new one,
Till, after cloying the gazettes with cant,
The age discovers he is not the true one;
Of such as these I should not care to vaunt!"

—*Don Juan, Canto I.*

THE last half of the present century has developed an extraordinary mania for heroes and hero worship, a strange and incongruous contradiction to the spirit of the age, which runs rather in vulgar sluices than in chivalric paths, and where gods are made in the image of the Midas, whom Ovid calls the *Berecynthius heros*. It was Burke who said, "The age of chivalry is gone; that of sophisters, economists, and calculators has succeeded." Wherefore, then, these heroes, and wherefore this hero worship? The answer is plain. Governments are seeking colonial expansion. In order to lend a show of reason to encroachments upon the rights of others, it is found necessary to create automatons, and clothe them in the mantle either of prophet or priest, and send them forth as pioneers of a policy hidden under the canting and hypocritical pretext of humanity—which satisfies the most, and even electrifies the unreasoning and irresponsible mob, composed mainly, as General Gordon has said, of "flunkies and sham heroes, and those who delight to grovel." Of such as these are our heroes made, and of such is our hero worship—heroes not born as poets and warriors are, but made to order by the hand of selfish government.

There is a lesson to be read in this regard in the reply of the savage King of the Zulu Land to Her Britannic Majesty's Governor-General at Cape Town. "Go tell your masters," said the proud Cetawayo, "that I know you; first you send the missionary, then you send the consul to look after the missionary, then the army to look after the consul, and the army—turns out the king."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cetawayo's appreciation of modern European diplomacy was sincere and just; but he could scarcely be expected to understand that the European stock of heroes was manufactured and maintained in *quasi modo*.

The mantle of the hero worn by General Gordon has fallen upon the shoulders of a successor. Emin Pacha has passed into the heroic. It is told that he is in imminent peril, that he is surrounded by blood-thirsty savages, and that if he is not relieved he will die. The story adroitly published is a web with which to attract the world's attention, and first of all the flunkies and the grovelers.

Great Britain wants a hero and has made him to order. His name is Emin Pacha. Great Britain has been justly called a "land grabber," and, true to this policy, rather than to the specious pretext of humanity, she is ever on the alert to increase her territory and expand her colonial commerce. It will not be deemed strange, therefore, that England has responded to the appeal contained in the letter—the very latest information received—from Emin Bey, in which there is not a shred of evidence to show that he is in peril, but, on the contrary, that he is in perfect safety. As will be seen, he seeks to sell out his kingdom. It remains to be seen whether he can deliver his goods to Mr. Stanley, who has been chosen as the chief of the pseudo relief expedition.

The following extracts from Emin Bey's letter are pertinent and comprehensive. He writes from Wadelai, July 7, 1886:

"I have certainly some gleaming of hope that as Egypt appears to be unable to send us aid [books, arsenic, soda, and sugar are the only wants of which he complains], England may at some future day take advantage of the position in which we find ourselves to remain true to her former tradition of a humanitarian [*sic*] and a civilizing mission [*sic*].

"At the present time, when the European Powers are racing neck and neck to gain possession of districts in Africa, is it really possible that no one in England should have been enlightened enough to see how easy it would be to occupy the whole of our province, and this, too, without any cost? . . . I am glad to be able to tell you that the province is in complete safety and order."

This letter was addressed to Dr. Felkin, and was read before the Scottish Geographical Society. It reads as if it had been inspired in the British Foreign office, and of itself is an absolute refutation of the stories told of Emin's peril.

Mr. Stanley was in New York when this remarkable appeal to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England from a loyal (?) Egyptian officer was brought to the attention of Her British Majesty's government. He suddenly announced that he had received a dispatch from His Majesty King Leopold recalling him to Belgium. The following morning the New York *Herald* promptly denied this assertion in a cable from Brussels. It seems a fact, however, that Stanley was telegraphed to go to London, ostensibly by a Mr. MacKinnon, a wealthy Scotchman, who offered to contribute £20,000 for the relief of Emin. That the hand of the government was in the transaction was only too apparent, for at the same time the English authorities in Egypt caused Emin to be raised to the rank of Pacha by the Egyptian government, and subscribed out of the *Egyptian treasury* £10,000 for the relief of an Egyptian officer, who in fact had proposed to turn over his government to Great Britain!

In Egypt they are accustomed to just such surprises. In truth, it was only a repetition of the Soudan comedy, in which Gordon was permitted to return to Khartoum, and to take out of the treasury £40,000, plus £60,000, afterward sent him, for no other purpose as avowed than to surrender the country to a horde of savages, with whom England, at that moment, for her own selfish interests, was pleased to treat, and grace with the polite appellation of "ancestral sultans." It was an easier matter to acquire the Soudan, wrested from a Mahdi, than from Egypt, which still presents some difficulties to an absolute annexation. The Rev. A. P. Ashe, a returned missionary from Uganda, has recently complained that the case of Dr. Mackay, who has been held a prisoner for some time, with several other priests, by King M'wanga, has not received the notice that it merits. He says:

"When I first learned of a relief expedition for Emin I thought that Mr. Stanley would leave no stone unturned to rescue Dr. Mackay. When I considered that it was to relieve an Egyptian Pacha it never occurred to me for a moment that those Englishmen who were so anxious for the safety of the Egyptians would not have been much more anxious still for the safety of an English missionary. I made a mistake. I spoke to Mr. Stanley, he said: 'When I went to look for Livingstone I was asked to do it; when I crossed Africa I was asked to do it; you come to me and talk about this Englishman, but if I had been asked to rescue him, I might have considered it.' At the same time Mr. Stanley mentioned a very large sum of money which would have been necessary to enable him to negotiate successfully with the king."

The Rev. Mr. Ashe does not seem to know that which Emin's letter clearly announces, namely, that Emin has a political value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which neither the missionary, a prisoner, nor the murdered Hannington possesses. He does know, however, that money has no *cours* in Uganda; it is an unknown quantity there, and the hint that a large sum was necessary, etc., leaves Father Ashe to only one conclusion, and hence his disgust.

In the interval of Mr. Stanley's departure from London it is curious to note what was transpiring at Zanzibar, where a German fleet had assembled, ostensibly to demand reparation and punishment for the murder of one of their subjects at Kismayu—in reality to give strength and comfort to the German East African Colonization Society, already become a menace to British commerce on the coast. Dr. Junker arrived from Central Africa on the 4th of December, when he reported his friend Emin as in perfect health and safety. On the 21st, seventeen days later, frequent dispatches signed Junker urged the immediate sending of an expedition to the relief of Emin, and this, too, it will be understood, without any other basis than the information already possessed. Wherefore this sudden metamorphosis? Dr. Junker alone can explain. It is a mere supposition that Sir John Kirk brought about the revolution in Dr. Junker's mind about the condition of Emin. However this may be, Stanley has assumed to patronize Dr. Junker in a manner which is made the subject of comment by the *Saturday Review*, which says:

"There is at least one person who may be expected to read Mr. Stanley's letter to the Chairman of the Emin Pacha Relief Fund Committee with mixed feelings. He is Dr. Junker. If the doctor is one of those wise men who are indifferent to condescension and who know how to assent with solemn leer at the proper time, he will probably be in the main amused by the first dispatch of the great explorer. In any case it is nice to be told that you are 'amiable, frank, modest,' and not the less when it is by an authority who has been accused of a slight deficiency in one at least of these virtues. On the other hand there are people, very human and deserving to be sympathized with, who do not covet condescension. To one of them it would be as the sudden enduing of a hair-shirt to read in the press—not in one paper, but in all—they are 'plodding and painstaking' creatures, that as Mr. Stanley looked upon them he saw 'the patient honest man doing his best with all the faculties Nature gave him and education ripened for him.' To see yourself described as the 'honest Junker trudging patiently with his long caravan, making music with his accordion to the wandering tribes of the Welle-Makwa Valley, and collecting valuable facts for civilized mankind' would be trying to certain temperaments.

"To feel yourself taken up in the palm of Mr. Stanley's hand, like Napoleon in Gillroy's caricature, and measured and weighed, and called painstaking, plodding, honest (a most insulting adjective, which, in our opinion, would justify a challenge), long-haired and quaint, might have roused the wrath of some African

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

travelers. What the conduct of Bruce would have been under the provocation we can guess. Probably Dr. Junker is a wiser man than the fiery Bruce, and has the sense of humor, and that imperturbable pride which is the best of all defenses against impertinence. He will doubtless laugh, and not as much as try to disturb that sense of his own greatness which caused Mr. Stanley's bosom's lord to sit lightly on his throne."

Who is Emin Pacha, and how is it that he is an Egyptian Governor of the Central African Provinces annexed to Egypt in 1874?

In 1875 Hans Schnitzler, an Austrian subject, born in Moravia, Silesia, Austria, in 1839, having studied in the medical institutes of Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, and possessing decided tastes for botany, geology, and anthropology, made his way from a port on the Red Sea to Khartoum.

General Gordon, then Governor General, for some unaccountable reason had a great aversion to Austrians, and this was particularly manifested in the case of both the Voyager Marno and Consul Hanzell. Dr. Schnitzler, nothwithstanding this fact, succeeded in overcoming Gordon's dislike and entered the Egyptian Soudan service as a surgeon. Later, Gordon sent him up to the post of Fatiko as *mudir*, and it was there, in 1877, that Hakim Schnitzler abjured the Christian religion and adopted that of Mehemet, assuming from that moment the Arabic title of *Hakim Effendi Emin*, literally, *the faithful doctor*.

Neither Dr. Felkin nor Dr. Ashe seem to have either the will or the courage to declare that the Doctor had changed his faith, although the fact must be perfectly well known to them both. It tends to destroy somewhat the romantic interest which has been awakened in the fate of Emin in the Christian world; but at the same time it is the surest gage that he is not, and never has been, in peril. Emin was shortly afterward promoted by Gordon to the rank of Bey and sent to Uganda as Governor, where, at the Court with King and courtiers, all of whom were subject to Moslem association, he has acquired much influence. Emin's apostasy is a blessing in disguise for Dr. Mackay, and the other priests held by the bloodthirsty M'wanga doubtless owe their lives to the friendly protection of Emin Pacha, who is known and respected as a faithful follower of Islam among the Moslem courtiers and counsellors of the King. When General Gordon retired from the command of the government of the Equatorial Provinces in 1879, he left Emin Bey as Governor, with headquarters at Lado, near Gondocoro. With a knowledge of the storm of insurrection which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was gathering in the Soudan, Emin went down to Khartoum in April, 1882, to confer with Raouf Pacha, then Governor-General, as to the best means to avert it. Raouf was an insolent half-breed, whose chief characteristic was his dense ignorance, vanity, and incapacity. He was surrounded with such men as Geigler, as the type of officials promoted by Gordon in a spirit of ridicule, but who contributed largely by their abuse of power to the insurrection which has ended in ruin and disaster. Neither Raouf nor his counsellors would listen to the intelligent warnings of Emin, but he was told to return to his provinces and mind his own business. Since then—June, 1882,—until a few months ago, no word has come from Emin. The stories told of his battles with the Mahdi's people are apochryphal, for it is not at all clear that the insurgents have ever been within hundreds of miles of Emin's camp at Lado, where we know he now is with some four thousand black regulars well armed with Remingtons, and several thousand irregulars.

General Gordon, it is well remembered, returned to the Soudan, and entered Khartoum on his Quixotic mission on the 18th of February, 1884. The 26th of January, 1885, Khartoum fell, or was evacuated, the mystery of which has still defied all attempts at discovery. General Gordon's journals, in Khartoum, have been published, and there is nothing about Emin. And yet we are told that Gordon's steamers foraged along the Bahr-el-Abiad, the navigation of which was uninterrupted from Khartoum, and along which it had been an easy matter, down to the period when the Mahdi invested the city, to have sent a steamer to Emin, who, on his part, might easily have used his steamers, plying between stations south of Lado to Wadelai, to have gone to the rescue of Gordon. If not by the river, Emin could have taken the land route, which the writer discovered in 1874, when reconnoitring the river Saubat, and by which, during the dry season, there was communication between Bor, near Gondocoro, the Saubat, and thence to Khartoum. What mystery attaches to Gordon's silence about Emin, whom he knew to be established with his garrison at Lado ?

What is the meaning of Emin's inertia during all the months when Gordon in Khartoum was holding at bay the rebel forces ?

Was there a feud between Emin and Gordon ? Was it the old hatred of the Austrian which had broken out anew and impelled Gordon to remain in Khartoum rather than seek the safety

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he was sure of finding at Lado? Was this the reason that Emin did not go to the relief of Gordon ?

Emin has invited England to occupy the Equatorial Provinces which have been won by Egypt at the cost of much suffering and many sacrifices. England, in response, has sent Stanley. If Emin returns it is possible that he may lift the veil of mystery which still envelops the siege and fall of Khartoum, and add, perhaps, some positive information as yet wanting as to the fate of the eccentric but gallant Gordon.

C. CHAILLÉ-LONG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRACTICAL PENOLOGY.

THE number of criminals in California, when considered with reference to the entire population, is so large that the problem of criminal reform has become one of salient importance to the individual taxpayer in that State. The climatic and social causes of the unusual proportion of offenders have for some time occupied the attention of the advanced physiologists of the commonwealth, and have been satisfactorily located. It has also been discovered that those causes will be temporary, and are results of the newness of the California civilization. The word physiologists is used advisedly, for the reason that among the penological investigators, there, the cure of crime has come to be regarded as a physiological, rather than a psychological problem, and this fact has given rise to a somewhat novel and eminently practical prison system, which it is the purpose of this paper to describe.

The Folsom State Prison, the smaller of California's two penitentiaries, is located in the uplands at the head of the American River, in the central portion of the State. It is handsomely built of granite, and at the present time contains about six hundred and fifty inmates. It was constructed seven years ago, according to the accepted principles in prison architecture, and in the directions of cell arrangement, ventilation, sanitary precautions, etc., does not differ materially from other modern institutions of its kind. The necessities of public economy, and the difficulty in getting legislatures to accord to criminal matters the attention they deserve, have hitherto compelled an undue crowding of the prisoners, and otherwise interfered to some extent with the theoretical plan. These interferences, however, will probably soon disappear, and in any event do not concern this article, since it is the system alone that is of interest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That system aims only at the reform of the individual. It is based, not upon the belief, but upon the demonstrable truth, that all crimes—except those born of sudden impulse and extraordinary circumstances, a small percentage at best—are caused either by bad health or bad moral, not general, education. It regards the law-abiding man as one who, through the fixed physical habit of toil, finds it no great hardship to labor for a livelihood; and, through the fixed mental habit of submitting to the established social and moral laws, finds it no great hardship to be curbed by them in his daily pursuit of happiness.

Per contra, the criminal is defined as one who, not having formed the self-sacrificing habit of work; or having become by some physical degeneracy predisposed to idleness and morbid impulses; or having no moral ideas, or else erroneous ones, finds through some or all of these causes the laws of society to be an uncomfortable curb, and so breaks them. To remove the fundadamental differences between the criminal and the law-abiding man, the system therefore aims, first, to make the prisoner physically sound; secondly, to fix in him physically the habit of toil, which includes the willful sacrifice of comfort during eight hours of the day and six days of the week; and, thirdly, to convince him that his personal happiness depends upon his obedience to the laws. To teach him, in other words, the lesson of right and wrong, not from the religious, sentimental, or relative, but from the practical, personal, and absolute point of view.

When the sentenced offender arrives at the institution where he is to remain for one or more years, he is stripped, his description is taken, and he is photographed, both before and after the cutting of his hair and the shaving of his face. He then takes a tank bath, dons the prison suit, and goes to his cell. He takes his meals with the other new arrivals and "first-table" prisoners. He is not allowed outside the building, and, with the exception of the rules which are told him, is left to discover for himself the conditions by which he is surrounded.

The two long cell-buildings are built in two tiers each and are entirely inclosed by an outside stone and iron structure. There are wide promenades between the walls, and in these the prisoner is allowed a certain amount of liberty each day. The first discovery he makes is that the great majority of the prisoners go out each morning and enjoy the air, the landscape, and the sunshine,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while he is allowed only that meager share of the sunlight which sifts through the gratings in wall and roof. He quickly perceives a second and more important fact. He is allowed three meals a day, which are as follows:

Breakfast:—Boiled beans, bread, and coffee.

Dinner:—One day in the week, corned beef and cabbage; two days, roast mutton; two days, beef or mutton stew, with potatoes; two days, roast beef, with potatoes; and bread and coffee daily.

Supper:—Three days in the week, boiled beans; three days in the week, mush and syrup; coffee and bread daily.

All coffee herein mentioned is sweetened, but without milk.

This is the regulation prison fare. The meat is furnished by contract, is good, and is thoroughly cooked. It is not believed that the beef would do to serve *à la moelle* at Delmonico's, or that the mutton would melt in any epicure's mouth, but it is nutritious and edible. It quickly becomes quite unpalatable to the prisoner, however, in view of certain facts.

Through the large room in which he eats, there constantly float the odors of beefsteaks, mutton chops, bread-puddings, and other savory foods, and these odors are as quickly and clearly segregated by the sharpened sense of the prisoner as are the component factors of an orchestral strain by an expert musician. He instantly experiences a sense of injustice. Convicts are very sensitive to unfairness of any kind. He is naturally extremely desirous in his limited sphere of happiness to get all the comforts within reach. He wants the air, the liberty of the grounds, and, above all, good things to eat. The palate is a potent means of influencing the great majority of men, but with the convict, as may be imagined, is far more influential than with any other class. He inquires, with interest, the meaning of those, Lucullian banquets, his invitation to which has been overlooked, and learns that the luxurious diners are all workers, and are entitled to the extras only through their toil. In a very short time, a few days as a rule, the convict comes to the conclusion, of his own accord, that he wishes to work. There are cases in which the prisoner's apathy and indifference to surroundings place him beyond the reach of this temptation, and these are met by special treatment, but they are too few in number to need consideration here.

Herein, it may be remarked, an important obstacle has been overcome. The desire to work is, to the average prisoner, a new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sensation. It was a natural and fostered desire to escape work which probably impelled him to crime. Moreover, there has been no coercion, which most prisoners resent, the first impulse of the social Ishmaelite being to defy and oppose all authority. Furthermore, in the cases of prisoners sentenced for life, it is otherwise well-nigh impossible to induce them to work, since a man sentenced to prison for life is usually indifferent to results, and willing to make things as unpleasant for the authorities as he can.

The average convict, having thus become desirous of working, obtains permission and is allowed an interview with Benjamin Chambers, the Captain of the Guard. The Captain examines him as to his strength and ability, informs him concerning his value, from the working standpoint, but gives him a chance among the workers, making it perfectly clear that the prisoner's comfort while incarcerated depends entirely upon himself. Then the convict is set at work in the yard.

This yard, in which the chief industry of the prison is carried on, is an immense quarry. The hills in the vicinity are masses of solid granite of the best quality, and this is of appreciable benefit to the system. Working on stone is an excellent kind of employment from the sanitary standpoint. It employs all the muscles to a greater or less degree, and taxes the system harmoniously. It takes place in the open air and the light of the sun, and is, consequently, to be preferred to work indoors at looms or benches. In fact, no kind of labor can be found which sooner transforms the pale prisoner, weak from incarceration and degenerated by the use of alcoholic or narcotic stimulants, into a strong, sturdy, and healthy man than swinging a hammer over a block of stone in the pure air and bright sunshine of Central California. It should be said, however, that the system applies equally well to all kinds of labor, as long as labor can be found for prisoners. Stone work is not a necessity. It is merely preferable to some other industries.

The prisoner is put at work, and immediately given a place at the second table. His *menu* is now a little more varied, and consists as follows :

Breakfast:—Beef or mutton stew, potatoes, boiled beans, bread and coffee. On Sunday mornings, syrup.

Dinner:—Two days in the week, soup of barley, macaroni, beans, or of rice and vegetables; one day, corned beef and cab-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bage; two days, roast beef; four days, roast mutton; two days, boiled rice; bread, potatoes, and boiled beans daily. On Sunday, cake and tea.

Supper:—Two days in the week, mutton stew; four days in the week, mush and syrup; beans, bread, and tea, daily.

The prisoner comes to this luxurious array of comestibles with an appetite sharpened by labor. The open air, exercise, mental awakening, and stimulated circulation, have aroused him and made him hungry. The new repasts are so much enjoyed that they sometimes take on a fictitious in addition to their substantial value. The ascent from the first to the second table becomes a memorable event, and the impulse and resolve to work tend to become fixed. In the language of many of them, "Any feller wot don't work is a fool," and that, it may be remarked, is precisely the conviction that the system aims to establish.

The convict, as a rule, is not primarily of much value as a laborer. His muscles are soft, and his physical capacity for steady and sustained effort is small. His powers of self-sacrifice and self-restraint are undeveloped. The habit of work, to which the social plan condemns all men, he never has attained. But no one is better informed concerning his failings than the prisoner himself. He has a strong and sharp spur, which urges him to escape forever from the "Bull Beef" table, and dwell in peace and plenty under the banner of "Cake 'n Tea."

The result is that he tries hard; in some cases overworks at first. A spirit of emulation, a most healthy moral sign, is excited in him. He compares his rude and meager achievements with those of skilled workers who began as he did, untrained, and his ambition to improve is strong. He improves steadily in skill, and more rapidly in health. His muscles harden, his face browns, and a stimulated circulation, from the best of medicines, exercise, is changing the color of his liver, and removing his tendency to brooding and morbid thoughts. He feels differently, looks differently, acts differently, and thinks differently, and every one of the changes is for the better. Finally, his period of probation is passed. He has established himself as a fixture at the second table. Then he looks ahead once more.

The Nirvana of prison circles is as yet unattained. It is a Nirvana of hard work rather than luxurious ease, but its delights are very alluring. They consist of the succulent chop and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sizzling steak. Brown-crested bread puddings inflame the sensuous appetite, while corn bread and hot rolls are not figments of the imagination, but absolute and attainable realities. The desire to please the authorities now develops strongly. The good-will of the Captain becomes a consummation devoutly wished, because the judgment of the Captain alone upon the work performed determines whether the prisoner's energy and skill combined entitle him to promotion. Convicts, as a class, are of small mental force, and the moral forces, such as ambition, operate more sluggishly with them than with men of finer organization; but the ambition to reach the first table seems to be general in its operation, and the typical convict exemplifies it.

The judgment of the work is perfectly impartial. It depends only upon a close watch of the men and a careful scrutiny of their results. Raised on probation to the third table, the bill of fare becomes as follows :

Breakfast :—Mutton chops or beefsteaks, potatoes, stewed beans, five days in the week corn bread, two days hot rolls, syrup, and coffee.

Dinner :—Two days in the week soup of barley, macaroni, beans, or of rice and vegetables; two days, roast beef; one day, corned beef and cabbage; four days, roast mutton; two days, boiled rice; one day, sour crout; two days, salad; bread, potatoes, beans; bread pudding and tea daily.

Supper :—Four days, mutton chops or beefsteaks; two days, mutton or beef stew and hash; three days, cake; three days, cracked wheat and oat-meal; one day stewed apples and stewed prunes; bread, potatoes, beans, syrup, and tea daily.

The valuation of this food, through the same train of thought that has raised the prisoner to the third table, keeps him steadily at work to the extent of his ability. Descents from the second table to the first are not numerous; those from the third to the second are rare, and occur less from lacking industry than from an unlooked-for quarrel or some such impulsive infraction of discipline. The lesson of experience is, that when a prisoner gets to the third table he stays there.

There is a special supper given those who are called upon for extraordinary labor, which sometimes becomes essential. And there are some trifling details unnecessary to consider in this general outline. The fact, however, that this system works

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exactly as well in practice as it would seem to in theory, can be verified by any one who chooses to visit the Folsom State Prison.

If he will stand on the veranda of the Warden's residence, during any hour in the working day, he will see three hundred men laboring with an untiring industry and an unabating energy that can be seen rarely, if at all, in the free factories or workshops of this country. Moreover, there is not a guard among them. The captain or his lieutenant may or may not stroll through the yard during the quarter of an hour while the visitor is looking on. The work goes on without relaxation under the convict bosses, and those bosses are as careful to fulfill their own spheres of duty as are the men they direct. The guards sit idly holding their rifles in the distant posts which environ the inner prison grounds, and but for them and the suits of gray and black stripes, the yard might be taken for one of the best drilled and most harmonious free quarries in this country. About two months ago the writer heard Mr. ———, a well-known iron-founder of San Francisco, say: "It is wonderful. Why, I am paying men the highest wages, but they don't work like that, and if I go up town for an hour or two the work drops down one-third."

The first aim of the system, to establish good health and physically fix the habit of work, is thus carried out. The second object, the removal of the effects of lacking or bad moral education, is done in a peculiar way. The prisoner is shown, not the badness, but the folly of crime.

It is useless to tell a prisoner that he is bad. He knows that already. It is almost useless—and the statement is made despite possible objection from religious reformers—to plead with him on a relative or sentimental plane. He either does not grasp or is not moved by the reasons thus given him for being good. But when it is made clear to him that he is a fool for committing crime, that he is thereby senselessly cheating himself of comforts in life to which he is entitled, he is instantly interested and rarely fails to see the point.

A religious instructor is by law made one of the officers of the prison. He addresses the prisoners upon moral and religious topics at intervals, and is allowed full freedom in administering all the good instruction and beneficial advice that his experience and studies furnish. The system, however, does not depend on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him to any great extent. The prisoner may sincerely repent, and may earnestly believe in religion, but none the less is he judged simply and solely by the work he accomplishes, and the time, his capacities considered, which he uses in doing it.

The kind of moral teaching that is constantly being conveyed to the prisoners in an informal, but none the less constant way, may be gathered from an interview which, like hundreds of others, took place near the close of last year between General John McComb, the present Warden and the inventor of the system, and one "Limerick," a departing prisoner, whose real name it is unnecessary to give.

Limerick was going out. He had served a six-years' sentence, which, by the credit system and good behavior, had been reduced to four years and two months. He was a big, brawny Irishman, who had originally possessed every capacity for success as a toiler, but he had been in prison during eighteen out of his twenty-seven years on the Pacific Coast. An unusual interest had been taken in his case, in consequence of the prevailing belief in penological circles that a "fourth-termer" is entirely irreclaimable, and fixed for life in crime.

"Limerick," said the General quietly, "you are going out."

"Yes, Gin'ral."

"You have been here a little over four years, Limerick."

"Yes, Gin'ral."

"And during those four years you have obeyed every one of the prison laws, and they are a little troublesome at times. Aren't they, Limerick?"

"They are, Gin'ral."

"And during those four years you have worked six days out of the week, and worked as hard as any man ever worked. Do you know that, Limerick?"

"Yes, Gin'ral."

"Well, all I wish to say to you is this: Remember that the world you are going out into is exactly like this prison. There are a good many laws, but they are very easy to obey, because nearly everybody obeys them. If you disobey them, you will be punished just as we would punish you here if you disobeyed ours. All men must work, Limerick. That is the first of all laws. Now, if, when you go out, you will obey the laws and work only half as hard, of your own accord, as you have, of your own accord,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worked here, you can have good clothes, better food than you get here, recreation and freedom, and, instead of being locked in behind stone and iron bars, be a man among men. Are you coming back, Limerick ?"

The man's brow knitted. There was no doubt that he was in earnest, for his voice was husky as he said :

"I'm not comin' back. I'm no fool, sir. Av I'd learned twenty years ago what I've learned here, it's not me as ud be trowin' away me life in jail."

And Limerick has not come back, and will not.

He is working steadily and comfortably, no matter where. But there is no man in his vicinage who appears less likely to cost the county a criminal trial, and the State a prisoner's maintenance, than he.

This practical lesson in practical morality is constantly conveyed to the prisoners, sometimes by a collective discourse, but oftener in the off-hand, quiet talks from the Captain or some of his aids to the prisoners in the daily contact of years. The character of the conversation varies with the characteristics of the man talked to. The men who are able to study the laws of right and wrong, and their fundamental basis, are very few. It is demonstrable to any advanced mind that the laws of morality and the laws of happiness are identical, but no such demonstration or wordy abstractions are employed with the prisoners, whose thought-capacity is very limited. The lesson conveyed is simple. It is only : "It pays to be good ; it does not pay to be bad. And any man who commits crime in preference to working honestly for his living, only brings unhappiness upon himself, and is foolish so to do."

It may safely be said that the system has already proved its utility. A number of discharged prisoners again commit crime, but the percentage is gratifyingly small. The system speaks for itself, and if perfect statistics were obtainable, would undoubtedly prove its value by clear mathematics. In the matter of expense, it necessitates only a trifling outlay, since the food is little more than ordinary fare, the difference being in the cooking alone, while the result in labor is a great and direct gain. Instead of the prison's value as a deterrent being diminished by the appetizing food, it appears to be clearly augmented, since re-convicted prisoners, after a trial of Folsom, prefer to be sent to the other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prison, San Quentin, where there are opportunities for idleness, the shops employing only a minority of the thirteen hundred convicts.

General McComb, whose broad and gentle charity, keen discernment, and rare executive ability have united in developing the system as its stands at present, has had many difficulties to encounter, and is still some distance from his ideal results. He has had to disturb many traditions, always a dangerous thing to attempt, and particularly so when in a political office and subject to criticism from partisan newspapers. Belonging to a party not in power, efforts which, to the credit of California's people be it said, have failed, have at times been made to vacate his place for the benefit of some clamorous henchman from the other ranks. Moreover, the short-sighted hewers of wood and drawers of water, the class who represent more votes than dollars in taxable property, are constantly endeavoring to interfere with a system whose only object is the common good, by declaring that prisoners shall not be taught to work at any trade. It is to be hoped that they will not succeed in producing any substantial changes, for the trial of this plan is of much more importance nationally than to a single State. If they do so succeed, it will simply add one more fact to that collection by which statesmen will soon be able to tell whether the intelligence of this country is destined to rule it for its good, or the ignorance of it for its harm.

It is greatly desired, further, that some supplemental machinery shall be devised by which the prisoner may be taken care of, after his release, until he has passed the dangerous shoals of the grog-shops, and anchored safely in the harbor of steady work. The Prison Commissioners, Messrs. John Boggs, W. C. Hendricks, Charles Sonntag, J. H. Wilkins, and R. T. Devlin, are also the Penological Commissioners of the State, and they have this matter in hand. They are deeply interested in the system, and are according it their intelligent support: so the prospect is, that, whenever the Legislature has disposed of matters of graver import, the system will have an important adjunct to its success.

HENRY J. W. DAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRIAL BY NEWSPAPER.

THE moral effect of the conviction of the New York Aldermen is weakened by the prominence of an evil almost as dangerous to our institutions as bribery itself. The efforts of their accomplices to excite a reaction of public opinion in their favor are encouraged by the resentment felt by many thoughtful men at the conduct of the press during these trials. The safeguards of innocence, which are the distinguishing feature of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, are in need of defense, if our people desire their preservation. Else trial by jury will, in cases that attract public attention, be wholly superseded by trial by newspaper.

The facts that bribery is a crime of all others the most dangerous to the body politic, and that few trained to weigh the value of testimony doubt the guilt of the Aldermen who have been convicted, do not justify the attendant circumstances. Those who feel the most horror at the cause of the public clamor should be the most anxious to secure fair play for the accused. Martyrs, as well as criminals, have been executed after conviction at the bar of public opinion, and the hanging of Mrs. Surratt is a proof that here in this century, as in France during her great revolution, in England after the tale of the Popish Plot, and in Salem, during the ministry of Cotton Mather, the roar of the populace may demand the blood of the innocent. That in peace men should prepare for war is a proverb better observed in Europe than upon this continent. The example of Marshall, when Burr was on his trial, should teach this people, at least, that the Constitution deserves the most respect when its observance blocks the satisfaction of the people's demand for vengeance.

That control over the press which our courts inherited from England was too severe, and was, therefore, long since abrogated. It is high time to consider whether a part of this should not be restored. The extent of the power and the justification for its existence are well stated by one of England's greatest chancellors, Lord Hardwicke: "There are three different sorts of contempt. One kind of contempt is scandalizing the Court itself. There may be likewise a contempt of this Court in abusing persons who are concerned in causes here. There may be also a contempt of this Court in prejudicing mankind against persons before the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause is heard. There cannot be anything of greater consequence than to keep the streams of justice clear and pure, that parties may proceed with safety both to themselves and their characters." For this reason two enlightened advocates of liberty of the press, Lord Erskine and Chancellor Kent, inflicted punishment upon those who sought, by words in a newspaper or pamphlet, to influence the decision of a pending cause. With the sentiment expressed by Hardwicke all must agree, however they may differ as to the means which should be employed to purify the streams of justice. The exercise, now and here, of the full power of the English judges would not be tolerated a month. There, a judge imprisoned a litigant for advertising for a witness to a fact at issue in a pending cause. Exercise of arbitrary power under much stronger provocation has frequently caused outbursts of public indignation in this country. Without the State of New York, almost every impeachment of a judge has arisen from his alleged infringement of the liberty of the press. Twice in Pennsylvania has a majority of the judges of a single court been tried at the bar of her Senate for such an exercise of the power to punish contempts. From this resulted the enactment there of the first statute limiting the authority of judges in this direction. The failure of the Senate of the United States to find Judge Peck guilty of an impeachable offense in severely punishing a member of the Missouri bar for a temperate criticism of one of his decisions was the cause of the enactment of the law, proposed by Buchanan, afterwards President, then Manager for the House of Representatives, which prevents the Federal judiciary from again thus offending with impunity. New York probably borrowed her law from Pennsylvania. A court in this State can punish an editor for the "publication of a false or grossly inaccurate report of its proceedings." Attempts to influence the action of judge or jury upon a case on trial, and criticism of them after they have rendered a decision, are in the eyes of our present law equally innocent.

It would be unwise, were it not impossible, to restore to our judges the full power exercised by the English Chancellors. The fate of the party which, despite its glorious history, was destroyed through the indignation engendered by the sedition law, illustrates the abhorrence of the American people at the infliction of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

special penalties upon *scandalum magnatum*. The common sense of the common people is not at fault. The history of the past, if not of the present, shows that it is well for the bench, as well as the legislature, to be subject to criticism. Though the dignity of our most eminent judges may suffer in the eyes of the vulgar, through the scurrility heaped upon them when their opinions, the results of years of study and experience, do not win the approval of some gentleman whose researches in jurisprudence were confined to his observation while reporting divorce trials and proceedings in police courts; and though that dignity may sink lower in the estimation of men educated to expect a higher standard of judicial decorum, when, to escape attack or to curry favor with the press, judges describe to reporters for publication, the impressions made upon them by the incidents of trials at which they preside ; the histories of George Jeffreys, Samuel Chase, and George G. Barnard are enough to prove the insolence of judicial power, not tempered by moral rectitude, when unbridled by respect for public opinion. One of the last attempts of the ring to perpetuate its misrule in New York City was the introduction of a bill at Albany to allow judges to punish, as a contempt of court, criticism of their judicial conduct. Had the bill been introduced a few years earlier, it might, perhaps, have passed, and thus prevented the splendid aid given by the newspapers to their allies at the bar, when the government was saved from that band of thieves.

The aid of newspapers in ferreting out criminals and in compelling prosecutions have been also indispensable to the public weal. In many recent cases has the perpetrator of a crime escaped the researches of the official detectives, only to be discovered by the ingenuity and energy of a reporter. And to the persistency of the New York *World* is due that legislative investigation which obtained the first evidence for the conviction of the aldermen. In many cases, also, although not under the administration of Mr. Martine, would the hand of justice have been stayed, did not the public prosecutor fear the censure of the press. Thus, those who control and conduct our great organs of public opinion render invaluable service, more now than ever before, in the detection, the punishment, and, consequently, in the prevention of crime. The same motives which inspire them to this have of late driven them beyond the point where their efforts can do good. In the work of a detective and of a historian they excel, but they step

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beyond their province when they undertake to try causes pending in the courts.

The effect of their efforts in this direction is growing daily more apparent. It is already the recognized duty of those who manage litigation in matters of public interest to see that so much of the evidence as is in their favor is given due prominence in the newspapers. This is effected sometimes by paying the publishers for its insertion in the columns of news; more often by influence, social or political, upon the proprietors, editors, and reporters. It is still considered unprofessional by most who adhere to a high standard of professional ethics, for lawyers to attempt to influence the bench by procuring the publication of editorials affecting pending litigation; yet this has been done of late by many who occupy high positions at the bar, and profess an exalted standard of morality. And many of our most eminent counsel have recently given opinions for publication in the newspapers concerning questions pending on appeal. These, let us hope, were printed for their effect in Wall street, not at Albany or Washington.

Is it not time to pause? Is there not a mean between a return to the tyranny of the Star Chamber and the retainer of an editor as associate counsel in each case of public importance? For, although I know no metropolitan journal which now sells the use of its editorial page, yet, if the present tendency proceeds, that must be the inevitable result. Even editors are human. If a return to contempt proceedings is deemed too harsh a remedy, why should not it be made indictable to publish any comments other than a fair report upon proceedings pending in the courts. Yet, when we remember the infrequency of convictions for criminal libel, it seems unlikely that many public prosecutors would push such an indictment to trial. A more efficacious remedy is, perhaps, a direct appeal to Cæsar.

Ye potentates who rule us with your quills, continue to pillory judges and jurymen whose decisions do not meet with your approval. We do not even offer a remonstrance at your then caricaturing the advocate who has done his best to save an unpopular client. But, while a case is on trial and before it has been decided, stand off and confine your strength to the enforcement of fair play. Without your aid no judge can secure it for the accused.

ROGER FOSTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COERCION BILL.

THE Coercion Bill of 1887 can best be appreciated by comparison with the Home-Rule Bill of 1886.

The condition of Ireland during the interval has not altered. There was an absence of crime in Ireland which was exceptional among civilized nations when Mr. Gladstone, last year, proposed the Home-Rule Bill; and the same virtue and peace prevailed up to the introduction of the Coercion Bill.

It is true that the charge of "increased agrarian crime" was boldly made by Chief Secretary Balfour "from his fortnight's knowledge of Ireland," in introducing the bill; but the charge was made without detail, and it was torn to shreds next day by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. For the years 1885 and 1886 the "agrarian crimes" of Ireland, reported by the constabulary, were divided into two heads—"threatening letters" and "offenses other than threatening letters." In 1885 there were 432 threatening letters reported, while in 1886 the number had risen to 507. But an increase of 65 threatening letters, the authors of which usually belong to three classes, schoolboys, weak-minded persons, and agents of the Government, is surely not good reason for abolishing civilized government in Ireland. Of offenses "other than threatening letters," there were reported 512 in 1885, and 518 in 1886—an increase of six in a population of five millions!

But compare the two bills: One bill offers Ireland more liberty and more good will than England has offered since the invasion in the Eleventh century. The other contains more menace, more open oppression and degradation than Ireland has had to endure since the Coercion Act of 1703, which, in Mr. Lecky's words, "abolished" the Catholic landlords of Ireland, and reduced the Catholic tenants to a position of abject and hopeless serfdom.

If Ireland deserved this Tory Coercion, Mr. Gladstone was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blindly unwise to offer Home Rule; but if Ireland deserved Home Rule in 1886, the Tory Crimes Bill is indeed a Tory Crime in 1887.

"The Government of Ireland Bill" of 1886 opened with these words:

1. On and after the appointed day, there shall be established in Ireland a Legislature consisting of Her Majesty the Queen and an Irish Legislative Body.

2. With the exceptions, and subject to the restrictions in this act mentioned, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty the Queen, by and with the advice of the Irish Legislative Body, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Ireland, and by any such law to alter and repeal any law in Ireland.

The Coercion Bill of 1887 strips Ireland of every vestige of civil right, and relegates her to the condition of a province guilty of some vast disorder or rebellion.

"It is the worst law ever proposed for Ireland by any Minister of England," says John Dillon, M. P.

"It practically suspends trial by jury forever!" says John Morley, M. P.

"It is one of the most shameful and indefensible violations of liberty that has been attempted by any Government within the last generation," says Charles Bradlaugh, M. P.

"In the name of real union and in the interest of true order, we condemn it," says Campbell Bannerman, ex-Irish Chief Secretary.

"In resisting this deplorable proposal," says Mr. Gladstone, "we are serving the cause of Ireland, and still more effectually serving the cause of Great Britain and of its world-wide empire."

"It is a grave conspiracy by which it is intended on the one side to coerce, if possible, the tenants of Ireland into the payment of impossible rents, and on the other side to compel the purchase of the landlord's interest at exorbitant prices, which compulsion, if successful, will most certainly lead to repudiation on a wholesale scale," says Mr. Parnell.

Referring to its indefinite duration, Mr. Gladstone said: "It makes our blood run cold. I do not think it possible for the wit of man to devise a scheme more likely to aggravate any mischief that exists in Ireland, and to stimulate to the uttermost international hatred."

To avoid misrepresentation of this extraordinary measure, to understand its full purpose, and to observe the consternation and derision with which it was received in Parliament by English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Irish Liberals and Nationalists, the following extract is given from Chief Secretary Balfour's speech introducing the bill on the night of March 28th (Report of the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*) :

"I now come to the bills which the Government propose to bring in. I have said the courts of law have difficulty in getting evidence, and also in getting verdicts according to the evidence, and we have a special provision—namely, the plan by which magistrates may examine witnesses on oath, even where no person is before them, charged with the committal of a crime. As to obtaining verdicts according to the evidence, we propose to abolish the jury system altogether (cries of 'Oh!' and laughter from the Irish benches) for certain classes of crime punishable by a certain length of imprisonment. We provide that two magistrates shall have summary jurisdiction, and a maximum power of inflicting six months' hard labor for the following offenses: criminal conspiracy, boycotting, rioting, offenses under the Whiteboy act, assaulting officers of law, taking forcible and unlawful possession (hear, hear, and cries of 'Oh! oh!'). While we do not propose to interfere with the liberty of the press, we hope that by giving power of summary conviction for inciting to commit offenses, we may prevent the press from being sharers in these crimes. (Hear, hear.) We borrow from the act of 1882 this provision:

"'And if the Attorney-General for Ireland shall certify that a fairer trial can be held in some other place in Ireland, the High Court shall direct that the trial shall be held at that other place.'

(Ministerial cheers, and oh, oh, from the Irish benches.) But we add this limitation and qualification—that if the prisoner can show that a fair trial is not to be held in the other place, he shall have the power to represent to the Court to that effect, and the Court shall have power to direct accordingly (laughter from the Irish benches). We also give power to the defendant or the Attorney-General to have a special jury in any case, in certain cases thus assimilating the criminal practice to the civil practice both of England and Ireland. But if these things are not enough to secure a fair trial, what expedient are we to adopt?"

A VOICE—"Send them to Belfast."

Mr. BALFOUR—"The possibility that a fair trial cannot be got in any part of Ireland is enhanced by the further consideration that even if a fair trial could be got it might be at the cost of the lives and property of the jurymen. We consider it an unfair burthen to cast on the shoulders of men arbitrarily chosen—the whole burthen of preserving the fabric of law and order in Ireland. We have been, therefore, obliged to devise some means by which the gravest class of offenders can be tried otherwise than by a jury in any part of Ireland. The methods by which the right honorable gentleman, the member for Derby, attempted to meet this difficulty was by having trial by judges without juries. We prefer retaining, as far as we can, the principle of the jury system so long as it can be applied with some hope of obtaining a fair verdict. We, therefore, under certain limitations, propose that the Attorney-General for England and Ireland may certify that a fair trial can be had in England, and then the trial may be held in England. (Cries of 'What part of England,' 'Why be held in England,' and 'Aldershot,' and laughter.) The part is to be named in the certificate. We are aware that, under certain circumstances, it might be a hardship to a prisoner to be tried in England, from the fact that he would not be able to convey his witnesses (oh, oh), his solicitor, and his counsel from Ireland. Therefore, we provide in the bill that Irish counsel should be allowed to practice in the English courts (Home Rule iron-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ical cheers), and also that the State shall provide the necessary funds (hear, hear). We have provided that the provisions which I have read shall only have application in those districts which are proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant (Oh! oh!) We hope we have made adequate provision for securing that the courts shall give verdicts according to the evidence. We have clauses which deal, as we think, with the case of dangerous associations. The Lord Lieutenant in Council will have power in certain limitations, which I shall presently describe, to make it an offense against this act to have anything to do with an association formed for the commission of crime, or for the carrying on of operations for the commission of crime, or for encouraging or aiding persons to commit crime, or promoting or inciting to acts of violence or intimidation, or for interfering with the administration of law, or disturbing the maintenance of law and order (laughter). When the Lord Lieutenant has issued a proclamation he may choose certain specified districts in which the proclamation is to have effect. ('What about the length of time?') Quite so, as I have explained to the House, we propose that the action of the bill may be limited in point of space. *We do not propose it should be limited in point of time* (loud Ministerial cheers)."

"This is the only Coercion Bill," says an ex-Home Secretary, "that has ever been proposed as perpetual."

"It is proposed in the interests of Ireland and of Liberty!" defiantly says Mr. Balfour.

What is the secret of a bill that evokes such burning words from English and Irish representatives? English Tories and Liberals, up to the present, at least, are represented by men who belong to the same class, educated in the same schools, having apparently a similar interest. Why, then, the wide mental and moral gulf between them, as shown by this bill?

Is it not because the Tories are legislating for their own class, while the Liberals are trying to legislate for the Empire?

Ireland is not fighting England now; she is in deadly grips with the belated saurian of aristocracy.

Like this, all former Coercion Bills for Ireland have been landlord bills. The two million new voters enfranchised in 1885 make the common people of England a political power for the first time. Up to that date the "English Commons," meaning Parliament, was a misnomer. Henceforth it is a tremendous fact.

For England, the landlords and aristocrats have not learned much in two centuries; for Ireland, they have learned nothing—or worse, they have increased their ignorance.

The truth is that England has evolved a vast social and political mistake in allowing the nobility and landed gentry to grow into immeasurable preponderance in the making of law.

To bring things to an equilibrium between the thirty-five mill-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ions who till the land and fill the cities, and the less than ten thousand who own the entire surface of the Three Kingdoms, cities and all, and to do this without a violent or anarchical period, is the greatest problem of the age; for it involves not only English interests, but touches the lines that subtend the property-laws of the civilized world.

All other European governments, within a hundred years, except England, have run the eraser of eminent domain over landlord boundaries.

England is face to face with an Abstract Idea that can no longer be held down by statute laws or systems of popular education in the hands of squires.

About 700 men own three-fifths of Ireland. Have they a right to evict and banish an industrious and peaceable population of nearly five millions?

Twenty-two men own nearly the entire land of Scotland. Have they a right to banish the whole Scottish people from their native land?

The law of the land, or, rather, of the landlord, answers, "Yes; they have that right." The people of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of all countries, say in their hearts, "It is wrong."

But how shall the "wrong" be placed on the law-books in place of the "right?" And how shall this year's "justice" become next year's "crime" for the lawyers and the national schools?

"If landlordism be wrong for Ireland," said a leading Tory, recently, "it must also be wrong for England." This man laid his finger on the bare nerve.

This is the problem immediately before England. In her own borders, the landlord aristocrat, even though Norman at first, long ago became bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh. Intermittently, at least, the heart-beats of England's classes and masses are in accord.

In Ireland the landlords and tenants are two bodies with ever discordant pulsations. The stranger in Ireland has remained a stranger. He went as a spoiler, and he has held on as a master. "English dominion commenced in a spirit of conquest, and it continues in a spirit of exclusion."

All legislation for Ireland, for seven centuries, has been wholly by and in the interest of the men who became landlords, whether

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by conquest, royal grant, or purchase. Two hundred years ago, the Lords Justices of England (State Papers, Ireland Record office, London) wrote: "Where the land goes, there will go the interest of a kingdom; and it must be a great mistake in policy, when there is so justifiable a pretense (as the fomented Irish "Rebellion" of 1688), to lose the opportunity of changing the proprietors from Papists to Protestants as this will be."

"Ireland," says William Hewitt (Aris. of Eng., page 272), "in the very beginning of our connection with her, was an aristocratic conquest and booty. From the reign of Henry II. to this hour, that fair island has been treated as a conquered country. At all times when the oppressed Irish have risen to assert their right to their own soil and to their freedom, by our superior might and unmitigated cruelty they have been rebranded by the fires of their blazing huts, and rebaptized in their own blood, as our serfs and slaves. We have robbed them of their lands, of their churches, of the government of their towns and country; we have sent over swarms of aristocrats to take possession of the estates of their ancient families; and hoards of parsons to occupy their churches and devour the tithes that had been given by their fathers for the maintenance of their own religion. From age to age they have been insulted, trodden on, thrust out of their own soil and their own offices, and taunted with being 'alien in blood, in language, and religion!' Great God!" exclaims this honest Englishman, "What business had we there? What business had we with their lands, their churches, their endowments? If we went as Christians to convert them, were violence, and robbery, and injustice the means? If we went to rule them, was it to be only by insult and slaughter? If we went to bind Green Erin to Britannia as a sister, was it to be only as an erring sister, whose fortune is to be flung on the streets and frowned on in her misery? In whatever character we *pretended* to go there, our eyes full of vengeance and our hands full of chains and plunder, betrayed us to the whole wide world as thieves and hypocrites."

No Irishman need repeat things so thoroughly said by Englishmen. Here are Mr. Gladstone's words in his address to the miners of North Britain on April 9: "For Ireland this new coercion is a question of suffering—and she knows how to suffer. For England, it is a question of shame and dishonor."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not necessary to go over the sickening details of coercion in Ireland in former centuries. For present illustration the record since the Union, in 1800, is sufficient.

"This bill is proposed in the interests of Liberty!" said the Tory defender of Coercion the other day. No wonder he was laughed at. But the Union was carried on the same cry—and eighty-seven years of incredible oppression since then is no laughing matter.

In those eighty-seven years, all nations in Europe have largely increased in population and well-being—except Ireland. She has grown weaker and poorer. The mills that used to grind on her innumerable water-falls have rotted into the streams. The mineral treasures have remained buried beneath her silent fields. The grass grows in the streets of her cities. The mouths of her navigable rivers have been allowed to fill up with the washings of the unprotected banks. The untold wealth of her sea fisheries has been used by other nations, and her own fishermen have starved on the strand, unable to purchase nets or boats, there being no way to get their fish to market.

The highways of commerce round other lands have been filled with sails, and their ports with merchandise, but Ireland, the best placed country in the world for commercial prosperity, is shunned by all traders. Her great bays of deep water are empty as a savage shore; and her intelligent and industrious population, starved out from their own fat and fertile fields, have streamed away like life-blood, enriching other lands with their strength and morality.

But the cruel hands that gripped their lives and their earnings at home have not yet let go. The Irish emigrant is not free from Ireland when he leaves her shore—he only "drags a lengthening chain." His earnings in America and Australia are still, through his affection, mortgaged to the Irish landlord. The enormous rents of Ireland are mainly paid from the wages of Irish-Americans. From the city of Boston alone, last year, the amount sent to Ireland in small sums was $560,000. This stream of liquid gold is flowing from every city and village in this and other countries; and one shrinks from even an estimation of its possible extent.

"For Ireland's sake, and for law and order," was the shibboleth of the Union in 1800. When that crime was consummated,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Irish nation became an English estate, divided among a few hundred owners. The "law and order" began in blood—in the hanging of Robert Emmet in 1803, and it has held on its deadly course through repeated famines, galloping bankruptcy, feverish rebellions, and a dwindling population.

Almost from the first day of the Union Ireland has been ruled with the law of Bedlam or a menagerie. There has been no decent attempt even to give her the poor chance to which her one-sided bond entitled her. Says the author of "Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland:" "The chronic poverty of the tenants made no impression on the landlords. The land was their own, and they were entitled to do what they liked with it—such was their view. The relation of landlord and tenant was to them a mere monetary transaction. To get as much money out of the land without putting any into it; to spend that money wherever and however they pleased; and to leave the tenants unhelped, uneducated, and unadvised, this was the Irish proprietor's notion of the functions and uses of a landed gentry."

The Irish landlords have had, since the Union, the completest power over their unfortunate tenants. Eviction was "a sentence of death," as Mr. Gladstone said. The evicted farmer could find no other farm; there were no other industries to employ himself or his children. There was nothing before him but emigration, or the poor-house and the grave.

To help the evicters and overawe the people, the eighty-seven years of the "United Kingdoms" have seen as many Coercion Acts for Ireland. Here is a shocking list of the Coercion Acts that have been in force in Ireland between 1800 and 1887:

1800	Insurrection Act, Habeas Corpus Suspension Act, Martial Law.	1819	
1801		1820	
1802		1821	
1803	Insurrection Act, Habeas Corpus Suspension Act.	1822	Insurrection Act, Act for Suppression of Catholic Association.
1804		1823	
1805		1824	
1806		1825	
1807		1826	
1808		1827	
1809	Insurrection Act, Martial Law.	1828	
1810		1829	
1811		1830	
1812		1831	Stanley's Arms Act.
1813		1832	
1814	Insurrection Act, Martial Law.	1833	Grey's Coercion Act.
1815		1834	
1816		1834	Grey's Coercion (Continuance) Act.
1817		1835	
1818			

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1835	Power granted Lord Lieutenant to issue Special Trial Commissions.
1836	
1837	
1838	
1839	
1840	
1841	
1842	
1843	Arms Act.
1844	
1845	
1846	
1847	Crime and Outrage Act.
1848	Crime and Outrage (Continuance) Act.
1849	
1850	
1851	
1852	
1853	
1854	
1855	
1856	Peace Preservation Act.
1857	
1858	Peace Preservation (Continuance) Act.
1859	
1860	
1861	
1862	
1863	
1864	
1865	Peace Preservation Act.
1866	Habeas Corpus suspended.
1867	
1868	
1869	
1870	Peace Preservation Act.
1871	
1872	
1873	Peace Preservation Act, Protection of Life and Property Act.
1874	
1875	
1876	
1877	
1878	
1879	
1880	
1881	Forster's Coercion Act.
1882	
1883	The Crimes Act.
1884	
1885	
1886	
1887	The Crimes Act.

What need to arraign or argue against a record like this? It stands condemned on sight. It is shocking to civilization and Christianity. And this dreadful legislation has been leveled against an unarmed and unorganized population, with a criminal record lighter than than of England or Scotland.

During those eighty-seven woeful years for Ireland all this arbitrary power has been wielded and directed by aliens ignorant of the people and heedless of their feelings and desires. The Coercion laws have been enforced by the bayonets of two standing armies—fourteen thousand constabulary and an average say of forty-five thousand soldiers—for whose support the Irish people are taxed, while even the material contracts for this support are controlled by English houses.

For the control of these forces and machines of coercion, a spècial class of garrison officials has been created. These men are vested with all privileges, which are taken away from the bulk of the population. The line used to be wholly drawn at religion, for this was useful in case of revolt. "A religious war" excites little outside sympathy. Religious riots in Ireland were the most available pretext and excuse for coercive rule; and the Orange garrison kept the stock full with at least one fresh riot a year.

But the fact that the most honored names in the Irish patriotic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

list, from Grattan to Emmet, and from Emmet to Mitchel and Parnell, are the names of Protestants, proves that the Irish people have never raised the religious question unless religion struck them a political blow.

The introduction of Catholics into the ranks of judges and magistrates of late years has indicated no change of policy. The Government made sure that the selected Catholic either was, or was willing to become, antagonistic to the people. And even thus selected, Ireland, with four million Catholics, has only 800 Catholic magistrates, and, with one million Protestants, has 3,300 Protestant magistrates.

To these irresponsible hands the power of the Coercion Law is given. Ex-Chief Secretary Trevelyan (a Liberal Unionist until the Coercion Bill and its officers filled him with dismay) condemns the bill of his colleagues as aiming not at criminals but politicians, as a weapon placed in the hands of notorious Orange partisans like Attorney-General Holmes and Under-Secretary King-Harman, who can strike down at will their opponents, the people's representatives.

The remedial legislation in the shape of a Land Bill, which is to follow the Coercion Bill, will come from the same hands. Its first proposal is that of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, that the tenant-farmers of Ireland be relieved by passing *en masse* through the Bankruptcy Court! The mixture of sarcasm and dishonor in this plaster for Ireland's wounds is worthy of its origin.

Ireland accepts the Coercion without flinching. For the first time there is light behind the bill. There is a voice beyond the cloud, and an assurance. "This bill is poison!" says Mr. Gladstone; "it must be presented to the lips of Ireland by other hands than mine. It is a bill aimed at a nation. It is not intended to suppress crimes known to the law; but it is a bill that makes things crimes that never were crimes."

"The eternity that is written on this law will soon disappear before a brighter time," said Mr. Parnell.

But the Coercion Bill calls for violent retaliation from Ireland. "War must be met with war," says an indignant English member of Parliament, Mr. Labouchere; "at all costs it must be demonstratively proved that Ireland cannot be ruled by coercion. If it be necessary, secret societies must replace the constitutional associations which the Government is trying to suppress. If the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government uses arms of despotism to crush out liberty, the people must reply by the use of those means which oppressed nationalities have ever had at their command, and have ever used in their struggles for their rights."

Had an Irishman used such words he would be in prison before their echo died. But the Coercion Bill compels Irishmen to think such thoughts as well as Englishmen.

Still the last resort of a nation is not yet presented to Ireland. On the contrary, instead of violent action, her policy under coercion is *deliberate inaction*. If the coercionists can only drive her to *do something*, they have gained a point. If she hangs back in the traces, refuses to move forward or backward, she will be the toughest problem Coercion ever puzzled over.

Instead of going into bankruptcy, as Mr. Chamberlain advises them, if the 500,000 tenant-farmers of Ireland will hold on to their "plan of campaign," paying no rent, taking no vacant farms, accepting no terms of purchase over five or six years' rental, they will defeat the coercionists by the very bankrupt threat invented for the peasant. The old landlord trick of dragooning the people into a revolt of despair is quite played out. The Irish people are united as they never were before. Even the expatriated millions, and tens of millions of several generations, are bound up in the unity of this unexampled moral nationality. The Catholic bishops and clergy of Ireland are as one man with the people; and the word they speak to England is one of peace and reason. On the 16th of February, 1886, the archbishops and bishops of Ireland assembled in Dublin, and addressed a letter to Mr. Gladstone, saying that it was their firm and conscientious conviction "that Home Rule alone can satisfy the wants and wishes, as well as the legitimate aspirations, of the Irish people." And the prelates added:

"We are fully satisfied that the demand for Home Rule thus put forward in no way transgresses the constitutional limits marked out by you. Its concession cannot trench either on 'the supremacy of the Crown' or on 'the unity of the Empire;' nor can it interfere with the maintenance of all the authority of Parliament necessary for the consolidation of that unity. . . . . As regards the settlement of the land question, we have no hesitation in saying that this cannot be better effected than by the purchase by the Government of the landlord interest in the soil, and the reletting of the latter to tenant-farmers at a figure very considerably below the present judicial rents."

So the shameful and cruel experiment of the landlords, though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foredoomed, must still be witnessed. A passionate and distinguished English Radical advised the Irish people to "declare the evictors to be lepers, and treat them as lepers." But it is better to let the declaration come from themselves. They are summing up their inhumanity in the view of the world. They are filling a deadly cup for Ireland which they themselves shall drink to the dregs in England. They blindly repudiate peasant purchase to make way for peasant repudiation. Oppression has outlived rebellion, but it cannot outlive contempt. Civilization could endure aristocratic landlordism while it was only an injustice, but must cast it out when it has become a nuisance.

Crime will increase in Ireland under this forcing process; it cannot be helped. In one way it is even a necessity. "You cannot fight oppression with rosewater," writes Labouchere. But before the evil goes too deep it will undoubtedly be stopped. It is not in the nature of things that this lawless law, carried on bayonets and decreed by unjust justices, should be long-lived.

Meanwhile, "the true means of reconciling an old enmity," says an able Irish representative, "and of consolidating for yet greater glory a vast and powerful empire, have been found by the statesman whose name will be honored in Ireland and in England forever."

JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

ECONOMIC PESSIMISM.

I BEG to paraphrase, in some slight measure, the recent communication from Mr. Datus C. Smith, upon "Economic Optimism," while at the same time answering the criticisms which he has made upon some of my work.

Every thoughtful man, as Mr. Smith well says, "sees at the present time a great and growing body in our population, who are not only dissatisfied with their position in the social order," but who are determined to change it, by one means or another, without much regard to the nature of things. They are perfectly honest in their intention, so far as the main body are concerned, but are groping their way in the dark and are, therefore, liable to misuse the power with which they are endowed, greatly to their own injury. This danger has at length attracted attention to the subject of political economy in a way that never has happened before, and the natural result is a flood of economic discussion, which cannot fail to be ultimately only beneficial. The contributors to this discussion may be divided into two general classes:

1st. Those who are the true builders of the new political economy, who are endeavoring to study facts and to find out in what way our existing institutions have been evolved from those of the past, in order that they may lay the foundations of economic science broad and deep, and may raise a structure of undoubted strength.

2d. Those who build a system on *a priori* theory, and who disregard facts; or who, when the facts are placed before them, are either incapable of understanding them, or else misinterpret their meaning. The latter class object to statements being printed which show how truly prosperous this country might be and is, so far as production is concerned; because, if they were to admit the conditions of general prosperity, they would be obliged to attribute want in the midst of plenty to faults which are personal, rather than public or institutional. Their panacea is legislation.

I think no economist has drawn more urgent attention to the adverse conditions of many of the inhabitants of this country than myself; and it may not be imputed to me as "economic optimism" that I have proved how remediable these adverse conditions may be, if those who attempt to remedy wrongs would begin at the right end; *i. e.*, by undertaking to show those who suffer want how they might improve their own condition or that of their children, if *they themselves* would take the proper course. The effect of imputing want in the midst of welfare to other causes may be very pernicious.

Mr. Smith takes exception

1st. To my method of showing what an abundance of food we now produce and how small an area of territory we make use of in so doing. He says that in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one place I have put the area of land now in use for the production of articles of food at 302,500 square miles ; in another place at only 265,000. He is wrong in the first statement, but right in the second ; he, however, overlooked the fact that the second statement is manifestly either a misprint or a miscopy of my own. On the page of the Century Magazine opposite the one in which this error occurred the exact facts are given ; and if he had read the article carefully he would have observed that in the 302,500 square miles once named is included the cotton field, estimated at 20,000 ; deducting this, the area devoted to food other than pastures, is 282,500 square miles. An unfortunate misprint makes it about 265,500. In point of fact, however, the latter figure is nearer the mark than the actual figures. If we were to deduct from the actual area in use for the production of grain and other articles of food, all the farms which are so wretchedly cultivated as to yield only seven to nine bushels of wheat per acre or nine to twelve bushels of corn (meagre crops which are not uncommon in the Southern States), it would appear that the great abundance of our food crops comes from less than 200,000 square miles of our territory out of at least 1,500,000 square miles of good arable land.

2d. In regard to cotton, Mr. Smith objects to taking the year 1865 as a basis for comparison, because in that year the crop was only 500,000 bales, as given by Mr. Nimmo.

I did not take the crop year 1865 as a basis ; I took the crop known as the crop of 1865-6, raised immediately after the war, of which the figures are given, showing the marvelous start which ensued after the war and the yet more wonderful progress since. The ante-war crops of twenty-one years are given in the same article ; and it is open to Mr. Smith or to any one else to select any date which he chooses to take for purposes of comparison.

In order to meet some other carping criticisms of this kind, I have prepared another table showing the progress in crops and other matters since 1870.

I will not send this, because it would be much better for my critic to make a few computations himself. All the facts are given by me as to the increase of certain specified products. If he will compare each five years with the next he will soon discover that the common or necessary means of subsistence have increased in much greater measure than population since 1865. Somebody has consumed the excess—who is it ? Have the rich gobbled up all the corn, cotton, iron, etc., etc.? If not, where is it ? Who has enjoyed it ?

Undoubtedly, Mr. Smith can indicate a few, especially in every great city, who have not shared the increase. Whose fault is it ? Can one help those who cannot help themselves, except by dealing with them personally ? Are ignorance, laziness, and vice remediable by legislation ? Are a few very poor because the many prosper ? If there is enough and to spare for all, is it optimism to prove it, in order that the true remedy for want may be found, and that discontent may not be increased from the want of consideration of facts by superficial thinkers ?

3d. Mr. Smith objects to the use made of the prices of Government bonds, and to the computation of interest upon them, by which it appears that $100 *in gold coin* invested in such bonds yielded at one period 16 and 66-100 per cent. interest. This is a fact ; it can be taken for what it is worth.

If it is desirable to consider other elements in the case, it may be safely stated that capital considered simply as capital can secure to itself now only one-half as much interest as in 1860 ; we will omit the comparison with the period of war and inflation, because the issue of inconvertible paper money not only defrauds the people who use it, but enables an astute writer to misuse statistics so that the figures lie even more than is their common habit when compiled by people who do not know what they mean.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4th. Mr. Smith objects to my computation of the value of the hens' eggs of the United States, and to the comparison of this value with the wool clip, the product of pig-iron, etc.

I think he may rightly take exception to my computation. It is now an accepted fact, well proved by many recent observations, that the average consumption of hens' eggs is greater than that of the factory operatives of New England, *i. e.*, more than one egg every other day, and at a higher price than twelve cents a dozen ; I will admit the fact, if he chooses to take exception to my previously carefully guarded statement, that the consumption of hens' eggs is now considerably over $100,000,000 worth a year, and that the animal value of the poultry and eggs combined is greater than that of pig-iron, wool, and silver combined.

5th. Mr. Smith objects to my statement of the "modern miracle of the loaf," and he pronounces it *graphic nonsense.*

He evidently does not comprehend the subject of which he treats. I have ascertained what the facts are at the present time. So effective has agricultural machinery become on some of the Northwestern farms as to render only 300 days, work necessary for the production of 5,500 bushels of wheat ; *i. e.*, three men working 100 days each during the harvest season. Leaving 1,000 bushels for seed, 4,500 bushels suffice for 1,000 barrels of flour. I stated that the milling and barreling of 4,500 bushels of wheat when converted into 1,000 barrels of flour required only the equivalent of 300 days' work of one man. It now requires less. Since that article was written, the movement of the wheat from Dakota to New York has been reduced to less than the equivalent of two men's work for 300 days. Therefore, the machinery of the farm, the flour mill, and the railway has become so effective that 1,000 barrels of flour can now be placed at the mouth of the bakers' oven in New York, with an amount of labor of men corresponding to *less* than 300 days' work of four men. I am prepared to prove these statistics by citation of all the authorities ; therefore the modern miracle of the loaf is not "graphic nonsense," but is a solid fact.

6th. The last point to which Mr. Smith takes exception is my computation of what has been saved by the effective service of the railway, measured by the charge on a barrel of flour from Chicago to New York. I did not put this saving high enough. In 1865 the railway service was very incomplete and had not become consolidated. It is very true, as Mr. Smith remarks, that under such conditions very little flour was moved from Chicago to New York, *all rail.* It became necessary to make use of the slow and tedious service of the canal system at a much less rate of charge than the railway lines ; but Mr. Smith makes no computation of insurance, interest, time, and labor lost on the canal ; admitting, however, that the canal service was cheaper than the railway service, yet my comparison holds good. Very little flour could reach the canal or the water ways compared to what is now carried by rail ; and when the charge for moving by wagon from the farm to the water way was added to the canal charge the cost of transporting flour 1,000 miles was then, in 1865, as great as or greater than the charge which I computed as the rate of 1865, had it all been carried by rail. The fact is that the railway service has made a greater gain to the people than can be represented by a mere reduction of their own charges, huge as that reduction has been.

The greater part of the food which is now brought from the West to the East could not be moved at all except for the railway, and the charge has been reduced to such a point that although the New York Central Railroad pays taxes to the State of New York in larger amount than the sum required to keep the Erie Canal in operation, it beats the canal. I have suggested to Mr. Smith that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

next time he takes exception to statements of fact he should find out for himself what the facts are, and I submit the following proposition :

At the present time the average rate of wages in the United States in nearly every art which is of any material importance is higher than ever before ; higher even, with very few exceptions, than at the worst period of paper money inflation in 1865, '66, and '67. On the other hand, the prices of the necessities of life are lower than they have been since 1840. If we compute wages both in rate and in purchasing power, men of special skill and aptitude who are now occupied as foremen, overseers, or in the very highest departments of the mechanic arts, are 100 per cent. better off than at the date named, for comparison, to wit : 1865-'67. The average mechanic or artisan is 75 per cent. better off. The common laborer is 65 per cent. better off. There has been a short period during the last five years when a good many common laborers were out of employment owing to the sudden cessation of railway building between 1882 and 1884. In the same period a very small portion of the operatives in iron works and other artisans found it difficult to obtain work. The number unemployed was, I think, much exaggerated. That period has gone by. There is work now waiting to be done for every industrious man or woman who will accept the conditions on which it is offered ; and those conditions are, as a rule, *better than they ever were before*, the exceptions being in some of the most crowded parts of a few large cities. If, then, there is want in the midst of plenty, it may neither be imputed to institutions, to an undue share falling to capital, nor to obstructive statutes in any great measure. It is due in most cases either to physical disability, accidental misfortune, or to mental incapacity, or unwillingness to undertake the kind of work that is waiting to be done. Undoubtedly there are many forms of wrong which are now sustained by National or State legislation which tend to a distribution of product which is not equitable, and the wasteful taxation of cities is a prime cause of city pauperism. The common undertaking in order to remedy these wrongs is to promote additional legislation. We might go on in this way, as they did in Great Britain, until at one period in the early part of this century there were 2,000 acts unrepealed on the statute books of Great Britain for the regulation of trade, commerce, industry, and labor. Then came the true remedy, which led Buckle to say something like this : That the greatest progress in human welfare, which had been made in modern times, had come by the repeal of statutes for the regulation and direction of industry, much more than by the enactment of others directed to the same purpose.

What is needed is a basis of fact either for the enactment or the repeal of laws. Had the true financial relation of this country to others been fully comprehended at the beginning of the Civil War, and had the ability of the people to bear taxation been fully considered, the country might have escaped all the vicious results of the legal tender act, and, in such event, would doubtless have been free from debt at the present time.

Is it not unreasonable to compute the cost of the depreciation of the substitute for true money issued under the name of *legal tender notes*, at the full amount of the outstanding unpaid obligations of the United States ?

EDWARD ATKINSON.

II.

MR. BOUCICAULT ON OPERA.

MR. BOUCICAULT'S great and long-proven abilities as an actor and dramatist give weight and authority to his opinions on any subject connected with the stage. It is, therefore, not without much diffidence that I find myself unable to agree with some of the statements and conclusions in his article on "Opera" in the April

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW; but it seems as if an extreme devotion to the drama proper, and a striving after epigrammatic brilliancy have led him into injustice, if not to operatic composers and librettists, at least to their interpreters. He states that he has only seen one actor (Ronconi) on the operatic stage, and that *he* could not sing; and he (Mr. Boucicault) proceeds to ask if any of the "wildest monomaniacs" of the press believe that operatic artists are or have been sufficiently good actors to obtain leading positions on the dramatic stage? I have never till now imagined that I was among the "wildest monomaniacs," but if Mario, Tietjens, Lucca, Patti, and Tamberlik could not or cannot act as well as the average leading man or woman, then am I indeed a fit subject for Bloomingdale. Where can we find to-day a juvenile man with the appearance, the grace, the fervor, and the power of Mario? Who, that ever saw him in the scene of the breaking of the sword in "La Favorita," will forget the mingled power, passion, and dignity which he portrayed? Tietjens, in "Norma" and "Medea," presented colossal figures as deeply charged with the true spirit of tragedy as anything I have ever seen on the purely dramatic stage. Lucca's agony of self-reproach and contrition in the cathedral scene of "Faust" surpassed the acting of Mrs. Herman Vezin, and I think Mr. Boucicault will allow that that lady was a good actress. Surely Patti, in "Il Barbiere," is at least equal to the average *comedienne*. Though I am only too conscious that judgment of acting is simply a matter of opinion, I believe that the majority of my readers, to most of whom these performances are known, will agree with my views rather than with the wholesale condemnation of Mr. Boucicault.

In considering opera as a form of art, Mr. Boucicault calls it "a misconception produced by the improper association of two muses." Why the association of words and music is any more "improper" in opera than in melodrama, I fail to see. In the former the music predominates, in the latter the words. In Mr. Boucicault's admirable melodramas he makes considerable use of music. Is not the effect of his cave scene in the "Colleen Bawn," to which he refers in his article, greatly heightened by the "incidental music?" Yet, if he is consistent, this association is "improper," because music has no meaning. When we attend a performance of opera we go fully aware that in real life people do not sing their emotions, and we overlook the unnaturalness for the sake of the pleasure derived, but have we not to overcome almost as much unnaturalness when we see a tragedy in which all the characters speak in verse?

Mr. Boucicault denounces opera because "if we remove the words and leave the music to stand alone, we find it incoherent, confused, without symmetry, or direction, or completeness." Now, this argument, if pushed to its logical termination, would deprive us of all songs. The music of an opera is no more intended to stand alone than is that of a ballad. It would appear as if Mr. Boucicault really meant to condemn all songs, for he says an "audience would naturally be unable to catch the words of the singer, which must be distorted in articulation."

Mr. Boucicault makes the somewhat astonishing statement that music "loses its charm by repetition." If this be true, why is it that the most familiar airs have the greatest charms for audiences? Are Mmes. Nilsson and Patti ever more effective with or more dear to their hearers than when they sing "Home, Sweet Home!" or the "Suwannee River?" And if this is due in part to the wedding of the words and music, it is a recognition of the principle on which opera is founded. Mr. Boucicault bases another argument against opera on the alleged fact that successive composers send their predecessors into obscurity. Among those he considers "on the shelf" is Mozart, an idea that will scarcely be accepted by musicians and lovers of music, who consider "Don Giovanni" immortal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To strengthen his arguments against opera, Mr. Boucicault quotes some very absurd lines from a hack-translation of "Lucia." If, however, he had chosen to quote from the original of some of the grand operas, say, for instance, "Les Huguenots," he might have found much to praise, and comparatively little to condemn.

Every art demands a compromise between the reason and the imagination. Opera very possibly demands a greater compromise than any other form of art, but the delight it confers more than repays the extra subordination of the reason. And while amusement is the end sought by patrons of theatres, though Mr. Boucicault may dub opera an "improper association," and say "out with it!" it is very improbable he will accomplish anything toward its banishment.

JULIAN MAGNUS.

III.

UN-AMERICAN AMERICANS.

WHY did not Arthur Richmond, in his brilliant analysis of the political career of James Russell Lowell, refer to the well-known fact of Mr. Lowell's perfect willingness to serve under Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State, though subsequently, after Mr. Blaine's defeat for the Presidency, the same Mr. Lowell loudly proclaimed his abhorrence of the man and his principles? As an American, I have always been proud of Mr. Lowell's literary acquirements, but I confess that of late I have been anything but proud of his political performances. As an American, therefore, I am not surprised at the arraignment of Mr. Lowell by the modern Junius. Let it be a warning to un-American Americans.

WASHINGTON MESSINGER.

IV.

RIP VAN WINKLE'S MANUAL.

THE "Inequalities of Suffrage, complained of by Mr. J. Chester Lyman in the March number of the REVIEW, are not quite so numerous and grievous as he would have us believe. Unfortunately, his article is based upon information derived from "Hill's Manual, 1882," which has led him into many serious misapprehensions. The table presented by Mr. Lyman contains no less than three mistakes in regard to suffrage in North California. It states that citizenship is not required of an elector, which is an error. The length of residence in a county entitling one to vote is given as 30 days, when it should be 90 days. Lastly, it says that an elector "must own 50 acres of land, or have paid his taxes." This was true 33 years ago, but since 1854 the Constitution of North Carolina has not sanctioned a property qualification. It is to be deplored that this Rip Van Winkle's Manual is so untrustworthy; for Mr. Lyman has treated an important subject in a thoughtful manner.

M. H. H. CALDWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CURRENT AMERICAN LITERATURE.

ONE of the most valuable books that have lately issued from the American press is comprised in Dr. Wharton's three capacious volumes,* which set forth the American view of the principles and aims of international jurisprudence. It may be said that this work has a useful rather than an artistic purpose, that it belongs, therefore, rather to professional than to literary compositions. We have thought it scarcely worth while to draw the line so closely, seeing that not a few of the State papers here preserved reflect credit on the artistic proficiency as well as the statesmanlike acuteness of their authors, and in respect of methodical and cogent arrangement, of lucid, forceful, and, at times, picturesque expression, are truly literature of a sterling and high quality. As to the book's utility, it is so patent and so large that the marvel is how any American legislator or publicist could have effectively discussed any international question without its assistance. Of the stores of material here collected, much the greater part lay buried in manuscripts liable to quickly perish and practically inaccessible, or in printed documents of which only unique copies are known to be preserved. Years of unremitting industry must have been spent upon the task of searching out, bringing together, winnowing, condensing, and interpreting this immense mass of recondite and chaotic material; but so patiently, intelligently, and systematically has the work been done, that a moment's glance at the table of contents or the index will enable the statesman or commentator to discover the precise authorities, and all the weighty expressions of opinion upon the American side of any diplomatic controversy. Take the topics which are now, or have lately been, of special and even urgent interest to citizens of the United States—the fisheries question, the duties of neutrals, and the rights of extradition and naturalization as defined by treaties. Upon each of these heads the investigator will find in this huge repository the gist of every authoritative utterance, whether of the executive or the judicial departments of the United States Government. It is but simple justice to the author to add that some of the most powerful and illuminative papers reproduced or quoted in these volumes proceed from his own pen, and we need only point the reader, by way of proof, to Dr. Wharton's exhaustive exposition of the American construction of a much controverted clause in the treaty of 1868 between the United States and the North German Confederation, whereby the rights of our German American citizens temporarily residing in Germany are defined.

Of course, no reader of Dr. Wharton's digest will duly profit by it unless he has previously acquired a tolerable mastery of the general principles and universally accepted rules of international law, as well as of the views taken by European nations of controverted and unsettled points—views which, we scarcely need to say, often differ broadly from the positions maintained by the United States. Those who do not find it convenient to consult the authoritative text writers, and who have not at hand the larger compilations of Phillimore and

*A Digest of the International Law of the United States; by Francis Wharton, LL. D. Three volumes. Washington, Government Printing Office.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wheaton, will find the elementary treatise* prepared by Professor Davis a useful manual. After a somewhat close examination of this volume we are disposed to recommend it as a text-book to schools and colleges, though not without the warning which cannot be too often repeated to the investigator of this subject, that, international law being uncodified and, from the circumstances of its evolution, a fluctuating and inchoate science, if science it be, the infrequent citation of authorities by Professor Davis—an infrequency prescribed by limitations of space—should be made good by incessant reference to the authorities on the part, first, of the instructor, and ultimately of the student.

It is highly gratifying to those whose business it is to tell the truth about books, so far as they possess the capacity of seeing it, to come upon a piece of literary work so intelligently planned, and, as regards, at all events, the essentials of history so conscientiously executed as is the book which Mr. Benjamin has given us.† In the diction, to be sure, will be observed some marks of carelessness which should, doubtless, be ascribed to haste, and may be easily removed in the second edition that will probably be called for. We infer that the time and labor manifestly given to the examination of authorities left the writer but little leisure for perfecting the final draft of his narrative. The characteristic merits of this book are, first, the vividness and fullness with which it reproduces, from native sources, the legendary history which preserves all that we are ever likely to know about pre-Achæmenid times, unless, indeed, the further decipherment of cuneiform inscriptions shall throw additional light on the early Elamitic conquest of Assyria and Mesopotamia. In the second place, Mr. Benjamin has been at special pains to fill what is felt to be a serious gap in other popular summaries of Persian history, about a third of his volume being devoted to a minute portrayal of the great national reaction under the Sassanid dynasty against the Greek, or Syro-Greek influence under the Parthian kings. On the other hand, the Parthian period is merely outlined as being rather an episode or interlude than an organic phase of Persian evolution. For another reason, namely, that the ground has been repeatedly traversed, and is presumably familiar to the general reader, the revolutions and events of the twelve hundred years that have elapsed since the Moslem conquest of Persia are very swiftly sketched. It should also be noted that throughout, and, even when depicting the Achæmenid and Parthian periods, for which he is obliged to rely largely on Greek and Roman authorities, Mr. Benjamin has tried to write from the Persian point of view, though he is, of course, careful to avoid the national exaggerations and suppressions.

We know of no better corrective than Professor Hosmer's book‡ of the impression made by the venemous indictment launched against a race by Mr. Edouard Drumont in "La France Juive." The first third of his volume, dealing with the history of the Jews in the times preceding the ultimate dispersion under the Romans, is indeed a mere outline, the author wisely refraining from attempting to rewrite the historical parts of the Old Testament and the narrative of Josephus. In so brief a summary there are necessarily omissions which some readers will regret, and we note one error, namely, the statement on page 121, *apropos* of the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, that "the Jews have henceforth been wanderers without a

* Outlines of International Law; by George B. Davis, U. S. A., Assistant Professor of Law at the West Point Military Academy. New York, Harper & Brothers.

† The Story of Persia; by S. G. W. Benjamin, lately United States Minister to Persia. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

‡ The Story of the Jews; by James K. Hosmer, Professor in Washington University, St. Louis. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country." It is well known that the remnant of the Jews continued after the suppression of their revolt by Titus, to resort to Jerusalem, devastated as it was, and were not finally and inexorably debarred from it until about half a century later, when, in the time of Hadrian, their holy city was converted into a Roman colony. It is the second and third parts of this book delineating the mediæval and modern history of the Jews, that furnish an ample justification of its existence. The story of Israelite persecution and rehabilitation is recounted in an admirable spirit. We would particularly draw the attention of those who have read Drumont's acrid comments on the same themes to Professor Hosmer's chapters on the "Money Kings" and "Hebrew Statesmen."

It seems a pity that a collection of brief, popular histories so happily conceived, and for the most part so well executed as "The Story of the Nations" series should in any instance have departed from the general aim of assigning the exposition of a given subject to some writer specially qualified by original research for the work. We are not aware that the compiler of the volume,* devoted to that division of the Northmen which is mainly associated with the Duchy of Normandy and with England, has such special qualifications, which are, on the contrary, undoubtedly possessed by Professor Freeman, or, if he was unobtainable, by more than one other English student of Northwestern Europe in the early middle ages. Hack work, though it may be performed with a certain neatness and dexterity, is, in our judgment, out of place in a series of this order, whose pretensions to fresh and independent treatment have been, upon the whole, well founded. If another recent volume† of this collection seems less open to a like criticism, it is because the scope of the subject is too vast for any specialist, and any attempt to outline it implies eclectic, not to say superficial, investigation. It was, doubtless, no overweening confidence on the part of the compiler, but submission to the publisher's requirements, which prompted the essentially hopeless endeavor to depict in some four hundred small octavo pages the conquests of the Moslems during the six hundred years succeeding the Hegira, in the course of which they not only overrun but occupied at least two-thirds of the Mediterranean world and about a third of Asia. The many shortcomings of Mr. Gilman's book are probably as clearly seen by him and deeply regretted as they will be by any reader, and he needs not to be told that any summary of a theme so comprehensive has the incorrigible vice of satisfying nobody. Nor can we understand why a task so inherently impracticable should have been imposed upon him. We fail to see why, if in this series a separate volume is allotted to Hungary, to Switzerland, to Sicily, treatment equally detailed might not have been given to at least three great divisions of Saracenic history—to the Arab-Berber States that absorbed and, to some extent, transmitted the Latin civilization which they found planted in North Africa, west of Cyrene; to the Damascene caliphate under which the Arab mind and manners received a Greek or rather Byzantine stamp; and, lastly, to the line of the Abbassids under whom the dominating tincture became Persian. It is also plain from the results of Mr. Gilman's experiment that the life of Mohammed, or, at all events, the story of Arabia, should have been separately presented. As it is, half the space at the compiler's disposal is exhausted before he is ready to recount the work of the first caliphs, with which the story proper of the Saracens, as distinguished from the antecedent traditions of Arabia and the life of the prophet, may be fairly considered to begin.

* The Story of the Normans; by Sarah Orne Jewett. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

† The Story of the Saracens; by Arthur Gilman, M. A. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED